

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

14036

A JOURNAL OF THE
CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

VOLUME II
1908

Reprinted 1967 for
Wm. DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON
with the permission of
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



TH

C

AS

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY J. P. POSTGATE

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: WM. GARDNER HALE; T. D. SEYMOUR;
J. H. WRIGHT; W. PETERSON, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL;
T. G. TUCKER, UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

VOLUME II

1908

Reprinted 1967 for
Wm. DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON
with the permission of
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

RBA
classical

ORIGINALLY PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
 ROBERT MACLEHOSE & CO. LTD., AT THE
 UNIVERSITY PRESS, GLASGOW.
 REPRINTED OFFSET LITHO BY BIDDLES LTD.,
 THE CITY PRESS, GUILDFORD, SURREY.

On the
 Platonic
 Professors
 Notes on
 A Passag
 Ad Sene
 Pericles
 Dorothe
 The Epi

Summary

Gen
 Arc
 Nur

The Epi
 Claudius
 Plato *The*
 Some I
 V

The Seco
 On the N
 The Satu
 Contribu

J.
 Two Edi
 The New
 The Teb
 Recent L

Summary

Gen
 Arc
 Nur

In Men

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 1.

	PAGE
On the Names of Aelius Caesar, Adopted Son of Hadrian. A. S. L. FARQUHARSON	1
Platonica VIII. HERBERT RICHARDS	9
Professor S. A. Naber on Apollonius Rhodius. R. C. SEATON	16
Notes and Emendations to Seneca's Letters. WALTER C. SUMMERS	22
A Passage of Pindar Reconsidered. W. J. GOODRICH	31
Ad Senecae Dialogos. A. J. KRONENBERG	34
Pericles and Cleon in Thucydides. F. MELIAN STAWELL	41
Dorotheus of Sidon. A. E. HOUSMAN	47
The Epic Cycle (<i>to be continued</i>). T. W. ALLEN	64
<i>Summaries of Periodicals—</i>	
General	75
Archaeological. H. B. W.	79
Numismatic. WARWICK WROTH	79

No. 2.

The Epic Cycle (<i>concluded</i>). T. W. ALLEN	81
Claudius and the Pavian Inscription. TENNEY FRANK	89
Plato <i>Theaetetus</i> 167 c and 209 a. HERBERT RICHARDS	93
Some Differences between Speech-Scansion and Narrative-Scansion in Homeric Verse. J. A. J. DREWITT	94
The Second Legionary Camp in Palestine. R. KNOX M'ELDERRY	110
On the New Fragments of Menander. A. E. HOUSMAN	114
The Saturnian Metre. J. FRASER	115
Contributions to a New Text of the <i>Characters</i> of Theophrastus (<i>to be continued</i>). J. M. EDMONDS	119
Two Editions of Manilius (with Notes on Book I.). H. W. GARROD	123
The New Menander. HERBERT RICHARDS	132
The Tebtunis Papyri (Part II.). JAMES HOPE MOULTON	137
Recent Excavations in Rome. THOMAS ASHEY	142
<i>Summaries of Periodicals—</i>	
General	151
Archaeological	156
Numismatic	159
In Memoriam: THOMAS DAY SEYMOUR	160

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 3.

	PAGE
Contributions to a New Text of the <i>Characters</i> of Theophrastus (<i>concluded</i>). J. M. EDMONDS	161
Catullus II ^b . WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL	166
On some Fragments of Maecenas. WALTER C. SUMMERS	170
Notes on Manilius II. and III. H. W. GARROD	175
On Manilius III. 590-617. J. P. POSTGATE	182
Emendations in Athenaeus. T. G. TUCKER	184
On the Oxford MS. of Livy's First Decade. W. C. F. WALTERS	210
Varia Graeca. T. W. ALLEN	216
W. A. Merrill's Lucretius. J. D. DUFF	220
Cartault's A Century on Tibullus. J. P. POSTGATE	223

Summaries of Periodicals—

General	231
Archaeological. H. B. W.	237
Numismatic. WARWICK WROTH	239

No. 4.

The Place of Arbitration and Mediation in Ancient Systems of International Ethics.	
LOUISE E. MATTHAEI	241
Contributions to the Study of Final -s in Greek Adverbs. J. FRASER	265
The Battle-field of Old Pharsalus. T. RICE HOLMES	271
On Clement of Alexandria, <i>Stromateis</i> I. § 158. J. COOK WILSON	293
A Few Notes on Athenaeus. J. P. POSTGATE	294
The Senate under Augustus. J. C. STOBART	296
Ad Apuleium. A. J. KRONENBERG	304
Manilius III. 608-617. A. E. HOUSMAN	313

Summaries of Periodicals—

General	316
INDEX	321

PAGE
161
166
170
175
182
184
210
216
220
223

231
237
239

241
265
271
293
294
296
304
313

316

321

5

T

ON

R
the il
Verus
have
in his
prince
bore
but
more
De T
bien
pour
qu'il
invet
name

first

¹ A
Philol

² A

³ G

et seq

⁴ A

cf. p.

N

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JANUARY 1908

ON THE NAMES OF AELIVS CAESAR, ADOPTED SON OF HADRIAN.¹

HISTORIANS of the Roman Empire have been nearly unanimous in giving the ill-fated Caesar whom Hadrian designated as his successor the cognomen Verus ascribed to him by Spartianus.² Following the same biographer Annalists have given the names Aurelius and Annius to his father and grandfather. Noris in his *Epistola Consularis*³ maintained against Pagi that the original names of this prince were Lucius Ceionius Commodus, that neither he nor any of his family bore the names Aurelius, Annius, or Verus ascribed to them in the *Historia Augusta*, but that the name Verus has been mistakenly reflected upon him from his more famous son L. Verus Augustus the colleague of M. Aurelius Antoninus. De Tillemont⁴ rejected Noris' opinion on purely literary grounds, saying, 'il est bien difficile de croire qu'un auteur ait esté assez ignorant et assez malheureux pour nommer toujours un prince, mesme en faisant exprès son histoire, d'un nom qu'il n'a jamais eu.' By consequence the mistake, if mistake it be, is become inveterate and is repeated⁵ down to our own day. Klebs⁶ alone rejects the name, and the error is not corrected in Dr. Bury's edition of Gibbon.

The question of name connects itself with Hadrian's reasons for adoption first of Commodus, then of Pius and of Marcus Annius Verus, and generally

¹ A Paper originally communicated to the Oxford Philological Society.

² *Hist. Aug.* i. 23. 10, ii. 2.

³ Graevius, *Thesaurus Ant. Rom.* Tom. xi. p. 424 C et seq.

⁴ *Hist. des Empereurs* (1691), Tom. ii. p. 592; cf. p. 273.

NO. VI. VOL. II.

⁵ E.g. by Gibbon, Merivale, Duruy, Gregorovius, Schiller.

⁶ *Prosopographia Imp. Rom.* i. p. 327 'Reliciendum est testimonium biographorum, qui nomina priuati et Caesaris, patris et filii, Veri et Marci foede confarunt.' Also Dr. Routh tacitly: *Introduction, Golden Book*, p. x.

with the interrelation of these princes. Considerable confusion in minor points¹ disappears, if this be cleared up.

I shall try first to show that the true view can be discovered in the literary sources, and then confirm this from the epigraphic evidence; incidentally, I hope to explain the origin of the biographers' confusion. Xiphilinus says,² 'ἀρχάμενος δὲ νοσεῖν . . . [Ἀδριανὸς] ἀπεγνώσθη μὲν βιώσεσθαι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Κόμμοδον μὲν Λούκιον . . . Καίσαρα Ῥωμαίους ἀπέδειξε, Σερονιανὸν δὲ καὶ Φούσκον τὸν ἔγγονον αὐτοῦ ἐφόνευσε'; and again³ 'ἐπεὶ δὲ συνέβη τὸν Λούκιον τὸν Κόμμοδον ἐξαίφνης ἐγκαταλειφθῆναι' calling together his council Hadrian declared his purpose of choosing Aurelius Antoninus to succeed him.⁴ 'οὕτω μὲν ὁ Ἀντωνίνος αὐτοκράτωρ ἐγένετο' ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦν ἅπαις ἀρρένων παίδων, τὸν τε Κομμόδου υἱὸν Κόμμοδον ἐσπεποίησεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτῳ Μάρκον Ἀννιον Οὐῆρον . . . ἦν δὲ οὗτος ὁ Ἀννιος ὁ Μάρκος, ὁ Κατίλιος πρότερον ὀνομαζόμενος, Ἀννίου Οὐῆρου τοῦ τριῶς ὑπατεύσαντος καὶ χιλιάρχισαντος ἔγγονος. καὶ ἀμφοτέρους μὲν ἐσποίησασθαι τῷ Ἀντωνίῳ (sic Dind.) ἐκέλευε, προετίμησε δὲ τὸν Οὐῆρον διὰ τε τὴν συγγένειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν, καὶ . . .' Dion's history of Pius was lost when Xiphilinus made his abridgment but in the fragmentary epitome we read⁵ 'οὐ σφύζεται δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦ μετὰ τὸν Ἀντωνίνον ἀρξαντος Μάρκου Οὐῆρου τὰ πρῶτα τῶν ἱστορουμένων, ὅσα περὶ τὸν Λούκιον τὸν τοῦ Κομμόδου υἱόν, ὃν ὁ Μάρκος γαμβρὸν ἐποίησας, ἐπραξεν αὐτός . . .' Then, in the beginning of the epitome of Marcus' reign we are told⁶ 'Μάρκος Ἀντωνίνος . . . προσειλήφει ἐς κοινωνίαν τοῦ κράτους εὐθὺς τὸν τοῦ Λουκίου τοῦ Κομμόδου υἱὸν Λούκιον Οὐῆρον.'

The account, then, derived from Dion, an almost contemporary source, never applies the name Verus to the elder Lucius, and first ascribes that name to the younger when, *after the death of Pius*, he is taken as son of Lucius Commodus to be colleague of Marcus. On the other hand the name of Marcus, hitherto Marcus Verus or Marcus Annus Verus, changes with his accession to Marcus Antoninus. Nothing is said of any relationship between Hadrian and Lucius the elder, in fact we are expressly told that Servianus (a natural claimant on behalf of his own grandson) was indignant and that Lucius was chosen 'out of all' as a man after Hadrian's own heart. It is an error that Pius was without male issue,⁷ and that Marcus was related to Hadrian (if that is what the historian means), but this mistake seems to be due to the abridgment; probably what Dion said was that Pius preferred to honour his own kinsman, for such an account would agree with what is elsewhere stated of the prejudice he bore towards the young Lucius.

In the *Historia Augusta* (especially in Spartianus) there is grave confusion as to the names of Lucius the elder. Undoubtedly he is called repeatedly Helius

¹ E.g. the mistakes in Dr. Bigg's introduction to the Clarendon Press translation (1907) of M. Aurelius' *Meditations*, pp. 5, 6.

² Xiph. *Epit. Dion.* (Dindorf 1864) lxx. 17; cf. lxx. 1. 1.

³ *I.c.* 20.

⁴ *I.c.* 21. Zonaras, (ed. Par.) i. 591.

⁵ Xiph. lxx. 2 § 2.

⁶ Xiph. lxxi. 1 § 1. Zonaras, i. 594.

⁷ *Hist. Aug.* iii. 1. 7; cf. Orelli et Hensen, *Insc. Lat. Sel. Collectio*, 852, 853; Cohen, *M. sous l'Empire Rom.* ii. p. 443.

Verus. I
whether
choice:
Ceionius
appellat
once. I
'Ceionius
Verus
are told
authorit
pater fui

It is
but that
as heir a
are pecu
confusio
Helius,
fusion b
Aurelius

The
Aurelius
year the
Vetulen
Caesar.
is consi
confirm
held tha

In S
Helius
latus est
Lucius t
Each gro
is eviden
what is
omission
name of
Emperor
Ceionius

¹ *Hist. A.*

² *Hist. A.*

³ *I.c.* § 6.

⁴ *Hist. A.*

⁵ E.g. *H.*

⁶ Orelli,

Verus, but there is reason, from the contradictions in these writers alone, to doubt whether he ever in fact so styled himself. Spartianus says,¹ in regard to Hadrian's choice: 'Tunc Ceionium Commodum . . . adoptare constituit. Adoptavit ergo Ceionium Commodum Verum inuitis omnibus eumque Helium Verum Caesarem appellavit.' In what follows he is called Commodus thrice, Helius Verus Caesar once. In the same writer's life of Helius² we find the following confusions: 'Ceionius Commodus qui et Helius Verus appellatus est,' 'primum Lucius Aurelius Verus est dictus'³ (this is the well known name of his son), though here we are told that his father's name was Ceionius Commodus. Capitolinus too (a better authority than Spartianus) writing of the younger Lucius, says⁴ 'huic naturalis pater fuit L. Helius Verus.'

It is thus stated not only that his cognomen was Verus, or Commodus Verus, but that his nomen was Aurelius, though his father's was Ceionius, and that his title as heir apparent was Helius Verus Caesar. It may be noted that these biographers are peculiarly confused whenever they have to give names (see for example their confusion as to the names of Pius) and that they nearly always give the late form *Helius*, though they quite correctly term Hadrian *Aelius*.⁵ Further, unless a confusion between the two Lucii is acknowledged, we are obliged to give the name Aurelius to the elder before his adoption by Hadrian.

The Epigraphic evidence proves that he was not named Verus, much less Aurelius. He was consul for the first time A.D. 136. In two inscriptions⁶ of that year the names of the consuls are given in full 'L. *Ceionio*. Commodo. Sex. Vetuleno. Civica. Pompeiano. cos.' In the next year Lucius is again consul, and Caesar. Here coins and inscriptions are fatal to the biographers. His style⁷ is consistently 'L. Aelius Caesar,' never 'Aelius Verus Caesar,' as it should be to confirm the *Historia Augusta*. He is never termed 'Aurelius,' though it might be held that 'Aelius' had supplanted that name after his adoption.

In Spartianus⁸ he is called, by way of summary, 'L. Ceionius Commodus Verus Helius Caesar, with the suspicious addition 'nam his omnibus nominibus appellatus est.' This passage should be compared with one in the life of his son,⁹ where Lucius the younger is styled 'Lucius Ceionius Aelius Commodus Verus Antoninus.' Each group combines in an unreal title different stages of nomenclature: neither is evidence of the names borne at any definite time. Both give the names in what is approximately the historical order of acquisition, but in both groups the omission of Aurelius is remarkable, since it is elsewhere stated to be a family name of the older Lucius, and was the principal name of the younger when Emperor. This prince was called by Dion's epitomist Commodus the son of Ceionius Commodus, and the name Verus significantly attaches itself to him only

¹ *Hist. Aug.* i. 23. 10.

² *Hist. Aug.* ii. 2.

³ *l.c.* § 6.

⁴ *Hist. Aug.* v. 1 § 6.

⁵ *E.g. Hist. Aug.* i. 1. 2.

⁶ Orelli, 6086; cf. 1681, 4354 and *C.I.L.* i. 581 =

C.I.L. iii. 730.

⁷ Orelli, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 5461. Cohen, ii. pp. 257 et seq.

⁸ *Hist. Aug.* ii. 6. 6.

⁹ *Hist. Aug.* v. 1. 3.

at the moment of his accession. That Dion was unconscious of the reason for the change makes the coincidence more remarkable.

Capitolinus' ¹ account is: 'L. Ceionius Aelius Commodus Verus Antoninus qui ex Hadriani uoluntate Aelius appellatus est, ex Antonini coniunctione Verus et Antoninus.' He here states explicitly (though he had called his father L. Helius Verus) that the names Verus and Antoninus belong to his later history. It is possible that by the phrase *Antonini coniunctio* he also intended the truth, that the two names arose from his association with Marcus in the purple, though the phrase has been carelessly interpreted to mean that he got the names through adoption by Pius. At least the order Verus Antoninus is important: the latter is very rarely borne by him. Capitolinus continues ² 'post vii annum in familiam Aureliam traductus . . . fuitque priuatus in domo imperatoria xxiii annis,' and again ³ 'diu autem priuatus . . . Augusti filius appellatus est.' This is confirmed by the absence of Lucius' name from all coins of this period, and by the mention of him in Justin Martyr's earlier Apology. There Marcus is addressed as Verissimus the philosopher, Lucius as the son of Caesar and adopted son of Pius. Inscriptions ⁴ and coins alike confirm this account. Lucius Aelius Aurelius Commodus is the son of Pius or son of Augustus, while the name 'Verus,' ⁶ or its playful form 'Verissimus,' ⁶ is attached to Marcus. The usual style of the latter is 'M. [Aelius] Aurelius Caesar,' ⁷ though the name 'Verus' occurs in inscriptions and upon not a few Greek coins, and is a favourite with him and his tutor in letters ⁸ of this date. Lucius was consul A.D. 154. In a Greek inscription ⁹ of that date he is called ΔΟΤ. ΑΤΡΗ-ΔΙΟΤ ΚΟΜΜΟΔΟΤ.

On March 7, A.D. 161 Marcus succeeded and according to Capitolinus ¹⁰ 'fratrem sibi participem in imperio designauit, quem L. Aurelium Verum Commodum appellauit Caesaremque atque Augustum dixit.' ¹¹—'Antonini mox ipse nomen recepit, et quasi pater Lucii Commodi esset, et Verum appellauit addito Antonini nomine,' and more precisely perhaps in another place ¹² 'Verum uocari praecepit, suum in eum transferens nomen, cum ante Commodus uocaretur.' The phrase *quasi pater* is to be noted: it represents an explanation (not, I think, strictly correct) of the grant of his own cognomen to his brother, shows at least that there was something unusual in this act, and gives the clue to a later confusion. These statements, as well as the remarkable one that Marcus, at this date, took the name Antoninus, agree exactly both with coins and inscriptions. Further, Marcus is never, after this date, called Verus in any monument, or any literature, ¹³

¹ *Hist. Aug. v. 1. 3*: n.b. the omission of Aurelius.

² *I.c. v. 2. 9.*

³ *I.c. v. 3. 5.*

⁴ *E.g. Orelli et Hensen, 5482, 5200, but especially C.I.L. ii. 47. 1643.*

⁵ *E.g. Orelli et Hensen, 857, 5468, 7277. Cohen, iii. p. 134 (this also gives his mother's name Lucilla; cf. O. et H. 5467. 856).*

⁶ Eckhel *Doctr. Numm. Vat. vii. 69, Hist. Aug. iv. 1. 10, xvi. 6. 5*; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl. iv. 12* (Leipzig

1903), p. 326.

⁷ *E.g. O. et H. 6315. 3422. Cohen, iii. Coins of Marcus, 235, 237, 386, 394, 450, 580, 1043, etc.*

⁸ *E.g. Epistulae Frontonis* (ed. Naber) ii. 5.

⁹ Gruter, p. 1021; cf. Noris, *Graevius Tom. xi. p. 451, I.G.I. 1052, C.I.L. v. 8110*^m.

¹⁰ *Hist. Aug. iv. 7. 5.*

¹¹ *Hist. Aug. iv. 7. 6 and 7.*

¹² *Hist. Aug. v. 4. 1.*

¹³ Euseb. v. 1. refers to Lucius, *vide v. 5.*

while pr
bear tha
roboratio
invariab
as 'Ver
Lucius c
seems to
physicia
He says
ἀρχὴς
summon
μετὰ τὸν
ὀνομαζόμε
Ἀντωνίνου

The
were con
after the
Aelio A
Imp. Ve
Antonin
this year
having i
show be
(consider
of the im

It m
Lucius.
Pius had
the cogn
follows a
and supp
accession
cognome
the broth
adopted
tendency
marked

¹ *Epist.*

² Naber,

³ Galen,

⁴ For Se

⁵ 10.

⁶ ἀπὸ τῶν

⁷ Gruter,

while precisely at this moment Lucius begins to be called Verus, and continues to bear that name as his commonest title down to and after his death. Of minor corroborations we have the evidence of Fronto's letters.¹ Of the brothers Augusti he invariably addresses Marcus after his accession as 'Antonine' or 'M. Aureli,' never as 'Vere,' and that although he and Marcus had hitherto played upon the name; Lucius on the contrary he addresses as 'Vere,' and in one letter² at least that prince seems to allude punningly to the name he had received. The evidence of the physician Galen is the more significant that it is unconscious and partly incorrect. He says³ 'ἄρχη δὲ τότε Σεβήρος,⁴ ἐαυτὸν μὲν Ἀντωνίνον μετονομάσας, εἰς δὲ τὴν τῆς ἀρχῆς κοινωνίαν προσλαβὼν Λούκιον καὶ μετονομάσας Σεβήρον,' and (when summoned to wait upon the emperors at Aquileia) he says,⁵ 'ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἀντωνίνος ὁ μετὰ τὸν Ἀδριανὸν ἄρξας διάδοχον αὐτὸν ἔθετο τῆς ἀρχῆς, τὸν μὲν ἔμπροσθεν ὀνομαζόμενον Λούκιον κοινωνὸν ἐποίησατο καλέσας Βήρον· ἐαυτὸν δὲ μετωνόμασεν Ἀντωνίνον.'

The inscriptions A.D. 161 are most instructive. By good chance the brothers were consuls in that year. We have evidence of their respective styles before and after the death of Pius. The earlier⁶ give 'M. Aelio Aurelio Vero Caesare III L. Aelio Aurelio Commodo II cos.'; the later⁷ 'Imp. Caes. M. Aurelio Antonino III Imp. Vero Augusto cos. II.' Similarly the column of Pius⁸ is inscribed 'Diuo Antonino Aug. Pio Antoninus Augustus et Verus Augustus filii.' The coins of this year⁹ agree with the inscriptions, some few Greek coins¹⁰ (date uncertain) having in the case of Lucius the addition of Antoninus. The evidence seems to show beyond reasonable doubt that Capitolinus' story is correct, nor is it difficult (considering the notoriety of Verus) to believe that later writers allowed the lustre of the imperial name to reflect itself upon the elder Lucius.

It may be asked why Marcus chose to give his own most distinctive name to Lucius. The reasons were, I think, partly consistency, partly policy and sentiment. Pius had dropped his principal family name, when he was adopted, but had retained the cognomen or nomen Antoninus. The arrangement of names in his two sons follows a consistent and a convenient principle. Pius dropped Aurelius for Aelius, and suppressed all his own cognomina except Antoninus, so Marcus soon after his accession dropped Aelius, and marked his legitimacy by keeping Aurelius. For cognomen he dropped Verus and assumed Antoninus. To mark the loyalty of the brothers Lucius is given Marcus' cognomen Verus, as Marcus had taken his adopted father's cognomen. The names are (according to a prevailing imperial tendency) ceasing to be family names and becoming dynastic. The stages are marked as follows:

¹ *Epist. Frontonis* pp. 94 et seq.

² Naber, p. 130.

³ Galen, πρὸς τοὺς περὶ τύπου (Kühn) vii. 478.

⁴ For Severus instead of Verus cf. *Hist. Aug.* vii. 1. 10.

⁵ περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων xix. 18.

⁶ Gruter, p. 300. *C.I.L.* vi. 1984.

⁷ Orelli, 5472, 5483.

⁸ Orelli, 848.

⁹ Cohen, iii. M.A. pp. 12-26; cf. Cohen, iii. M.A. p. 1 (cf. 778 with 30). L.V. 1. 8 (pp. 130, 171, 173).

¹⁰ Given on Cohen's authority, iii. p. 170. I can find no other epigraphic evidence. The same question arises as to Geta.

PRIVATVS.		CAESAR or AVG. FIL.	AVGVSTVS.
(1)	(2)		
	T. AVRELIVS FVLVVS BOIONIVS ANTONINVS ⁵	IMP. T. AEL. CAES. HADRI ANTONINVS ³	T. AELIVS HADRIANVS ANTONINVS PIVS ⁴
(M. ANNIVS CATILIVS SEVERVS) ¹	(M. ANNIVS ¹ VERVS)	M. AELIVS AVRELIVS VERVS CAESAR ⁴	M. AVRELIVS ANTONINVS. ⁶
(L. CEIONIVS COMMODOVS) ¹	L. CEIONIVS COMMODOVS ²	L. AELIVS AVRELIVS COMMODOVS ²	L. AVRELIVS VERVS. ⁴ (once each) L. AELIVS AVRELIVS [VERVS]

It was policy, and convention well established is three parts of policy, to give Lucius this name. The selection of a colleague was contrary to the wish of both Pius and the Senate. By the gift of a popular name Marcus corroborated the gift of a daughter. The world, refined as vulgar, lends an ear to titles: this gave proof of the 'Concordia Augustorum' so constantly struck upon the coins. Disturbances were threatening in the East, and Marcus had perhaps already decided to send Lucius thither. The name Verus was popular especially with the Greek world. What more politic than to give, for these reasons also, a name which by accident had a connotation as well as a denotation. The emperor (with the practical common sense he so often showed) solved a difficult problem and avoided the situation which occurred under the sons of Septimius Severus.

To leave this hazardous ground for certain points in the biographers which are now plainer. Spartianus⁷ says that Lucius the elder was at first called L. Aurelius Verus, but that his father was Ceionius Commodus 'quem alii Verum, alii L. Aurelium, multi Annum prodiderunt.' This passage looks as if it had got into the elder Lucius' biography by mistake.⁸ It is an erroneous explanation of the Emperor Verus' name. Otherwise it is an unscientific genealogy⁹ offering several possible names for the Emperor's grandfather. That he was a consular we know from Spartianus: there is no inscription to fix his name. He was no doubt the consul of 106, the Commodus¹⁰ who in the Fasti is the colleague of Priscus.¹¹ This man's father was consul A.D. 78. Fortunately we have three¹² inscriptions for him, one from *Acta Arualium*. Like his grandson he is called L. Ceionius Commodus, and beyond doubt had not the cognomen Verus.

¹ Literary evidence only.

² *C.I.L.* xv. 732 (vide Mommsen's note) shows that *Hist. Aug.* ii. 7. 2 is incorrect.

³ Coins. *C.I.L.* vi. 998.

⁴ Many variants: coins and inscriptions.

⁵ Inscriptions only.

⁶ Once only with AELIVS, *C.I.L.* vi. 1021, 1012.

⁷ *Hist. Aug.* ii. 2. 6.

⁸ The mistake would be easier since the two biographies were together in the old order.

⁹ *E.g.* Aurelius Victor actually calls M. Aurelius,

M. Boionius, giving him for nomen one of his adoptive father's cognomina.

¹⁰ Clinton *Fasti Romani* i. 92 commits the blunder ascribed to Spartianus. As consul for A.D. 106 he gives L. C. C. Verus, citing as his authority Noris, the very author who had cleared up the confusion.

¹¹ Prosper Commodo et Rufo. Noris (Graevius xi. p. 287) Commodo et Prisco.

¹² *C.I.L.* vi. 1348, 1349, 2056 (A. A. p. 504). O. et H. 2260.

S
adopt
his im
tion o
adopt
is not
diui fi
name
Sparti
dubiet
certe
be Au
possib
stantia
makes
... et
Victor
It
noticed
about
letter?
discred
prevale
also va
W
like the
title th
philoso
express
to which
son A
name;
avenged
by the
knowled

¹ *Hist.*
² Bernh
be emend
This woul
³ *Hist.*
⁴ The
illustrated
⁵ *Μάρκος Α*
(i.e. *Ελευθε*
Rufinus:

Spartianus¹ says that Hadrian adopted Pius on the condition 'ut ille duos adoptaret Annium² Verum et Marcum Antoninum.' In this passage Marcus is given his imperial title, Lucius a name he never bore. There is latent a confused tradition of which we find traces elsewhere. It was held that Marcus had actually adopted his colleague (giving him therefore his name Annius), though at what time is not stated. Marcus and Lucius were sons of Pius and it was as brothers, 'Pii diui filii,' that they ruled the Roman world. A later age was perplexed by Lucius' name Verus. Capitolinus says that Marcus gave him that name 'quasi pater.' Spartianus³, or Spartianus' authority, goes one step further, though with some dubiety. He says 'eius est filius Antoninus Verus, qui adoptatus est a Marco vel certe cum Marco.' Here is the ascription of the name Antoninus,⁴ which' should be Aurelius, to Lucius, and the origin of the fable of his adoption. From this possibly by a corruption of Antoninus⁵ to Annius arises the story, otherwise unsubstantiated, of Lucius' blood relationship to Marcus, and a similar explanation makes clear the saying of Eutropius⁶ 'Post hunc imperavit M. Antoninus Verus . . . et cum eo L. Annius Antoninus Verus.' A parallel blunder is that of Aurelius Victor who calls Pius the son-in-law of Hadrian.

It seems almost impossible that such blood kinship should not have been noticed by either Spartianus or Capitolinus (or indeed by Dion), authors curious about niceties of descent. Finally, if the argument of this paper be just, the famous letter⁷ of Hadrian upon the foibles of the people of Alexandria is still further discredited. It has always been suspected for its anachronisms both as to the prevalence of Christianity and as to the adoption of Aelius Caesar. With it may also vanish the epigram⁸ of Hadrian, 'Habeat res publica quodcunque de Vero.'

Whatever the truth of the name Verus, History capricious in these matters, like the mortals whose 'crimes, follies, and misfortunes' she registers, has made the title the appanage of the inferior colleague of Marcus. This was the generous and philosophic ruler's own proper inherited cognomen. It was his name as it best expressed his character. He has come down to us with a name, itself colourless, to which he has given an aroma, almost a halo. The accident of death removed his son Annius Verus; Commodus has given an odious ring to Lucius' proper name; it was in this way that, if Lucius had been in any sense wronged, destiny avenged him. The name Severus, which Marcus first bore, has been perpetuated by the Emperor whose character it justly expressed, Marcus' son⁹ without his knowledge or consent. De Tillemont¹⁰ has remarked upon this subject 'la chose

¹ *Hist. Aug.* i. 24. 1.

² Bernhardt emends to Ceonium Verum; if it is to be emended, a simpler reading is Aurelium or Aelium—This would agree with the other confusions.

³ *Hist. Aug.* ii. 5. 12.

⁴ The error (possibly a clue to its origin) is well illustrated by Rufinus. Eusebius (iv. 14) says: 'Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Οὐῆρος, ὁ καὶ Ἀντωνίνος, υἱὸς αὐτοῦ (i.e. Εὐσεβοῦς), σὺν καὶ Λουκίῳ ἀδελφῷ διαδέχεται.' Rufinus: 'M. Aurelius Verus et Antoninus filius eius

cum Lucio fratre succedunt;' cf. pp. 382, 383 (iv. 26).

⁵ We have the form Annianus of Marcus.

⁶ Eutropius, viii. 10. 1, viii. 9. 1.

⁷ *Hist. Aug.* xxix. 8 'in filium meum Verum multa dixerunt, et de Antonino (so the best MSS.) quae dixerint, comperisse te credo.'

⁸ *Hist. Aug.* ii. 7. 2.

⁹ Orelli, 904; cf. 917.

¹⁰ *Histoire des Empereurs, l.c.*

ne vaut pas la peine de l'examiner ;' if I have taken another view, it is because in this case the epigram of Ausonius upon an unknown Lucius is not justified, since the epigraphic evidence seems so clear.

Truncatis consuulsa iacent elementa figuris :

Omnia confusis interiere notis.

Miremur periisse homines : monumenta fatiscunt ;

Mors etiam saxis, nominibusque uenit.

A. S. L. FARQUHARSON.

406 A
Λυσία διὰ
συνουσιασ
ΚΑΕ
γενομένου
ἐπιγίνου.

On δ
δοστις * *
suggest a
ὁρθῶς ἀπ
cf. Menar
other com

408 C

20 E.
Perh
23 B.
οὐκ ἴστε

I
notice th
passages
that exte
it in vers
from Pla
But it is

PLATONICA VIII.

(Continued from THE CLASSICAL REVIEW, Vol. XX, p. 11.)

CLITOPHON.

406 A. ΣΩ. Κλειτοφώντας τὸν Ἀριστωνύμου τις ἡμῖν διηγείτο ἑναγχος, ὅτι Λυσία διαλεγόμενος τὰς μὲν μετὰ Σωκράτους διατριβὰς ψέγοι, τὴν Θρασυμάχου δὲ συνουσίαν ὑπερεπαινοῖ.

ΚΛΕΙ. ὅστις, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἀπεμνημόνευσέ σοι τοὺς ἐμοὶ περὶ σοῦ γενομένους λόγους πρὸς Λυσίαν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἔγωγε οὐκ ἐπῆνουν σε, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐπῆνουν.

On ὅστις, which cannot be right, Mr. Burnet's note is 'ὅστις ἦν Hermann: ὅστις . . . Schanz.' Of the two I prefer Hermann's conjecture, but I would suggest a smaller change instead, namely to read the exclamation ὥς τις . . . οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἀπεμνημόνευσε, *how wrongly he stated!* For this ὥς with a negative cf. Menander 555 K ὦ γῆρας βαρὺ, ὡς οὐδὲν ἀγαθόν, δυσχερὴ δὲ πόλλ' ἔχεις, and other comic fragments.

408 C. Should we read προτρεπτικωτάτους δέ?

TIMAEUS.

20 E. ἦν μὲν οὖν οἰκείος καὶ σφόδρα φίλος ἡμῖν Δρωπίδου τοῦ προπάππου.

Perhaps ἡμῶν, but the dative may be right.

23 B. τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ ἄριστον γένος ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ παρ' ὑμῖν οὐκ ἴστε γεγονός.

I have no change to propose with regard to ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, but we ought to notice the great peculiarity of its use. This ἐπ' of *extension over* is elsewhere in passages akin to this attached to a word expressive or suggestive of something that extends, such as *rumour, report*, etc. Mr. Archer-Hind for instance illustrates it in verse from *Il.* x. 213, μέγα κεν—κλέος εἶη πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, and in prose from Plato's own *Critias* 112 E ἐπὶ πᾶσαν Εὐρώπην καὶ Ἀσίαν . . . ἐλλόγιοι ἦσαν. But it is one thing to say κλέος ἐπὶ, ἐλλόγιμος ἐπὶ, and quite another to say ἄριστος

ἐπί, because the latter phrase gives nothing that can be thought of as extending. I would not therefore exclude the possibility of a third epithet with a καί having been lost.

25 D. The island Atlantis was sunk in the sea by an earthquake, διὸ καὶ νῦν ἄπορον καὶ ἀδιερεύνητον γέγονε τὸ ἐκεῖ πέλαγος, πηλοῦ κάρτα βραχέος ἐμποδῶν ὄντος, ὃν ἡ νῆσος ἰζομένη παρέσχετο.

It has of course been noticed that the mud can only be called βραχύς by a strange confusion of terms. It would be the water above the mud that was really shallow. Can Plato have used such an expression? Codex A indeed has βαθύς; but this gives an unsatisfactory sense, because the depth of the mud when reached is immaterial. <ἐκ> βραχέος would yield the sense we really require, *near the surface*, like ἐξ ὀλίγου, etc., and may be worth considering. ἐκ would of course fall out most easily between πηλοῦ and κάρτα, but an Attic writer would prefer κάρτα ἐκ βραχέος to ἐκ κάρτα βραχέος, if indeed the latter was admissible.

For the insertion of a preposition cf. on 80 E below.

29 B, C. τοὺς δὲ (λόγους) τοῦ πρὸς μὲν ἐκείνο ἀπεικασθέντος, ὄντος δὲ εἰκόνας, εἰκότας ἀνὰ λόγον τε ἐκείνων ὄντας.

εἰκότας and ἀνὰ λόγον ὄντας are predicates, if the words are right, to some such phrase, not quite clearly shaped in Plato's sentence, as τοὺς λόγους εἶναι δεῖ. But can ὄντας stand as part of a predicate? I should have thought not, and that ἀνὰ λόγον, the real predicate, would repudiate an ὄντας. If this is so, read γε for τε. In the next words should γάρ be added after περ, where it would easily fall out?

33 D. χειρῶν δέ, . . μάτην οὐκ ᾔετο δεῖν αὐτῷ προσάπτειν οὐδὲ ποδῶν οὐδὲ ὀλων τῆς περὶ τὴν βάσιν ὑπηρεσίας.

A difficulty has been felt about the genitive χειρῶν. Mr. Archer-Hind supposes an anacoluthon: Stephanus suggested τὴν . . ὑπηρεσίαν to govern it: Stallbaum made it depend on an understood τι. In reality it depends on δεῖν, the infinitive προσάπτειν being thrown in extra, as in C of this very page οὐδ' αὖ τινας ἐπίδεες ἦν ὀργάνου σχεῖν: Rep. 459 B δεῖ ἄκρων εἶναι τῶν ἀρχόντων: Xen. Oecon. 21. 11 δεῖν φημι . . φύσεως ἀγαθῆς ὑπάρχει: Herod. 1. 73. 1 γῆς ἡμέρω προσεκτίσασθαι: Thuc. 5. 15 ἐμθυμία τῶν ἀνδρῶν . . κομίσασθαι: Eur. Med. 1399 χρήζω στόματος παίδων . . προσπτιξασθαι.

46 E. ὅσαι δὲ <τῶν> ὑπ' ἄλλων μὲν κινουμένων, κ.τ.λ.

The partitive genitive seems to me to need the article.

48 B. προσήκον αὐτοῖς οὐδ' ἐν συλλαβῆς εἶδεσι μόνον εἰκότως . . ἀπεικασθῆναι.

The phrase is always ἐν—εἶδει (see Ast's lexicon s.v.), and the plural seems unsuitable. Cf. the common ἐν—μέρει.

Ib. D. πειράσομαι μηδενὸς ἦττον εἰκότα, μάλλον δέ, καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς περὶ ἐκάστων καὶ ξυμπάντων λέγειν.

It is difficult to make any sense of καὶ ἔμπροσθεν, though Archer-Hind defends it and Burnet does not notice the suggestions for altering it. They are indeed not very satisfactory. I do not know whether my own is any better, but I think we might perhaps read μάλλον δέ καὶ <τῶν> ἔμπροσθεν, *more probable even than what went before*. Cf. on 46 E above.

49 E. Nothing which *becomes* (γίνεται) has permanence enough to be spoken of as *this* or *that*: φεύγει γὰρ οὐχ ὑπομένον τὴν τοῦ τότε καὶ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν τῷδε καὶ πᾶσαν ὅση μόνιμα ὡς ὄντα αὐτὰ ἐνδείκνυται φάσις.

τῷδε is very unintelligible here, and Burnet cites Cook Wilson's conjecture, τὴν τοῦ ὧδε. I fear this is not good Attic, for ὧδε in Attic is *hither* not *here*. (It is in fact difficult to find it used for *here* without a verb of motion in any prae-Alexandrian Greek. Herodas furnishes an instance or two (2. 98: 3. 96) and Theocritus several.) Before seeing this conjecture in Burnet's note I had thought of τὴν τῇδε, and that might perhaps stand. Of course the thing, not the point of space, would be in question.

52 C. οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐφ' ᾧ γέγονεν ἐαυτῆς ἐστίν.

Archer-Hind is right, I think, in saying that the genitive ἐαυτῆς depends on the whole phrase αὐτὸ—γέγονεν, but why did he not illustrate the construction from the well-known *Rep.* 438 A foll. *ὅσα γ' ἐστὶ τοιαῦτα οἷα εἶναί του*? The genitive there is our genitive here.

53 E. τοῦτου γὰρ τυχόντες (they have not done it yet) ἔχομεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

ἔχομεν, though not necessary, is very probable.

66 B. Burnet ignores Stallbaum's proposed introduction of ἀνάγκη to give accusative and infinitive some construction. Without binding myself to ἀνάγκη—συμβαίνει for instance is just as likely—I think something is certainly needed.

69 B. ταῦτα ἀτάκτως ἔχοντα ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἐκάστῃ τε αὐτῷ πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλα συμμετρίας ἐνεποίησεν.

Stallbaum calls ταῦτα—ἔχοντα 'absolute'; Archer-Hind governs it 'by the compound phrase συμμετρίας ἐνεποίησεν, as though Plato had written *ξυνηρμόσατο*'; Kühner-Gerth ii. 2. p. 90 calls it an anacoluthon. I should conjecture that the participle παραλαβὼν is to be inserted, probably before or after ὁ θεός. So a few lines below, οἱ δὲ μιμούμενοι παραλαβόντες ἀρχὴν κ.τ.λ.: 30 A πᾶν ὅσον ἦν ὁρατὸν παραλαβὼν: 68 E ταῦτα πάντα . . ὁ . . δημιουργός . . παρελάμβανεν.

80 C. I am surprised at Burnet's not noticing Stephanus' change of τὸ δέ . . τό τε to τῷ δέ . . τῷ τε, which seems absolutely necessary to give

construction and is a most easy correction. Cf. for instance the readings in *Rep.* 547 D τῷ μὲν τιμᾶν.

80 E. ἡ δ' ἐρυθρὰ πλείστη περὶ αὐτὸ χροῖα διαθεῖ, τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς τομῆς τε καὶ ἐξομόξεως ἐν ὑγρῷ δεδημιουργημένη φύσις.

Construction and meaning are very difficult until we read <διὰ> τῆς. Cf. on 25 D above.

86 D. καὶ σχεδὸν δὴ πάντα, ὅποσα ἡδονῶν ἀκράτεια καὶ θνηδὸς ὡς ἐκόντων λέγεται τῶν κακῶν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς ὀνειδίζεται.

Mr. Archer-Hind comments on the odd juxta-position of ἀκράτεια and θνηδὸς, for which however he can see 'no plausible correction.' If correction is needed, as I think it is, an easy means lies close at hand. Did not Plato write κατ' θνηδὸς? The confusion of καί and κατὰ is familiar. I have doubted whether ἀκρατεία might not be an improvement, but probably the nominative is right.

87 D. ἀξύμμετρον γὰρ ταῖς μεγίσταις ξυμμετρίαις.

It seems to me very questionable whether we ought not to substitute accusatives for datives here. Cf. the phrase immediately following, ἡ καὶ τίνα ἄλλην ὑπέρεξιν ἄμετρον, which, to tell the truth, also gives me an uneasy feeling that ἀξύμμετρον . . . ἀξυμμετρίας (or ἀξυμμετρίαις, for the dative would be better in this phrase than in the other) was Plato's real expression.

88 A. σῶμα . . μέγα καὶ ὑπέρψυχον.

ὑπέρψυχον has been noticed as a strange compound, though there are parallels. Perhaps ὑπὲρ ψυχὴν ὄν may be worth considering.

Sufficient notice has perhaps not been taken of the remarkable discrepancy between the exordium of the *Timaeus* and the *Republic* of which (or part of which) it is a summary. Socrates in the *Timaeus* gives the chief points laid down in the *Republic* faithfully enough: it is the implication involved in his references to it that presents the peculiarity. Not only is there no explicit mention of the *Republic* having been a narrated dialogue, that is, of Timaeus and the others now present having only heard from Socrates the narration of a dialogue supposed to have taken place the day before (that is two days before the *Timaeus*); but his language would certainly imply according to any ordinary method of interpretation that they had been present and taken part in the dialogue itself. This would seem to be the natural meaning of the repeated first persons plural, διειλόμεθα, εἵπομεν, ἐλέγομεν. It is not natural, though of course possible, to understand the *we* contained in these words to be *I and the people I was talking with* rather than *you and I*. Anyone who read all this without knowing the *Republic* would certainly think Timaeus, Critias, and Hermocrates were then present.

The fiction of a fifth person who was to have been present at the *Timaeus* dialogue is no doubt only introduced as a little detail to give verisimilitude and reality to the scene. Similar, I suppose,—for there does not seem to be any other reason for it—is the pretence in the *Philebus*, another late dialogue, that Philebus has handed over to Protarchus the defence of his position, so that the dialogue is named after one who takes next to no share in it. We naturally ask why Philebus has done this: that is, we fall into Plato's trap and take the thing seriously. So here we want to know who the absent man is. The disturbance of the order of speeches in the *Symposium* by Aristophanes' hiccup is another such device.

CRITIAS.

107 E. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ παραχρῆμα νῦν λεγόμενα, τὸ πρέπον ἂν μὴ δυνάμεθα πάντως ἀποδιδόναι, συγγινώσκειν χρεών.

The first words (ἐκ . . λεγόμενα) are curiously devoid of construction, much more so than the accusatives we occasionally find at the beginning of sentences, which the writer vaguely meant to provide with a construction as he went on, but finally left without one. In such a case we can usually see pretty clearly what he had in his mind. But here the turn of the sentence is so harsh and clumsy, that I cannot but suspect error. Did not Plato add to λεγόμενα some participle governing it and standing as a sort of subject to συγγινώσκειν, such as ἀκούοντας or σκοποῦντας? The omission of any τὰ with λεγόμενα (τὰ δὲ ἐκ—λεγόμενα) seems to make the case especially doubtful. Contrast the otherwise more or less parallel openings of sentences in 109 A and 110 B.

108 B. εἰ μέλλεις αὐτὰ δυνατός γενέσθαι παραλαβεῖν.

I hardly know what those who are satisfied with αὐτά suppose it to refer to. There is nothing definite in the context with which it can be associated, nor does it seem possible to make it mean vaguely *the speaking, the turn to speak* (παραδίδομεν . . τὸν ἐξῆς λόγον 106 B). Probably we should write αὐτό and refer it to θέατρον, the audience, whom Critias is about to take over from Timaeus.

109 C. ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν κατ' ἄλλους τόπους κληρουχῆσαντες θεῶν ἐκείνα ἐκόσμου.

(1) Elsewhere κληρουχεῖν is transitive: (2) ἐκείνα is strange. We should get over both difficulties by reading <τὰ> κατ' ἄλλους τόπους. The dialogue contains many examples of this somewhat periphrastic use of the article, e.g. 114 B τὸ τῆς χώρας: 114 E τὰ περὶ τὰ ζῷα: 117 A τὸ τῆς ἐργασίας. Plato is indeed always fond of it.

110 A. I think τούτων περί needs a δέ or τε added.

111 C. χρόνος δ' οὐ πάμπολυς ὅτε δένδρων αὐτόθεν εἰς οἰκοδομήσεις τὰς μεγίστας ἐρεψίμων τμηθέντων στεγάσματ' ἔστιν ἔτι σᾶ.

Burnet marks this as wrong and gives in a note the words which Cobet proposed to insert after *ὅτε*. It does not seem to me, especially considering the involved order of words often adopted in the *Critias* and other late dialogues, that there is any real need for suspicion. In sense *ὅτε* and *τμηθέντων* should be taken closely together, as though Plato had said *χρόνος οὐ πάμπολυς ὅτε (since) ἐτμήθη στεγάσμαθ' ἃ ἐστὶν ἐτι σᾶ*.

Id. καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ὕδωρ ἔκαρπουτ' ἐκ Διὸς (ἡ χώρα), οὐχ ὥς νῦν ἀπολλύσα ἀπὸ ψιλῆς τῆς γῆς εἰς θάλατταν, ἀλλὰ πολλὴν ἔχουσα καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν καταδεχομένη.

Stallbaum wished to read *πολύ* for *πολλήν*, and Jowett in like manner understands it of abundance of water, reading I suppose also *αὐτήν*. But this is quite a mistake. *πολλήν* is *much soil*, into which the water is received. But what exactly is *ἀπὸ ψιλῆς τῆς γῆς*? If *γῆ* is *soil*, it surely cannot be called *ψιλῆ*. The rock, the land, the place can be called *ψιλός*, but not the soil itself. It would be an odd epithet for *γῆ* in almost any case; but, if *γῆ* is removable soil, as *πολλήν* seems to show, it becomes almost impossible. Perhaps then we may consider whether *ψιλῆς* does not agree with *ἐαυτῆς* or *χώρας* implied in the subject of the sentence, so that *τῆς γῆς* would depend on *ψιλῆς* and not have *ψιλῆς* agreeing with it. This is the construction a little further on, 112 A *γῆς αὐτὴν (i.e. τὴν ἀκρόπολιν) ψιλὴν περιτήξασα πεποίηκε*.

112 A. *σεισμῶν ἅμα καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος φθορᾶς τρίτου πρότερον ὕδατος ἐξαισίου γενομένου*.

Scholars have to some extent boggled over *τρίτου*, but I do not find that any one has suggested, as I venture to do, that we should read *τρίς*.

Just below should *ἀποβεβηκνῖα* be *καταβεβηκνῖα*? Cf. 110 E, etc. No such use of *ἀποβαίνειν* is cited,

Id. D. *τὸ δυνατὸν πολεμεῖν ἤδη καὶ τὸ ἐτι (i.e. δυνατὸν πολεμεῖν)* certainly seems right: *those who were old enough and those not too old*.

113 A. Should *τὸ δ' ἐτι* be *τόδε δ' ἐτι*?

116 B. *τοῦ δ' ἐντός* should be *τὸν δ' ἐντός*, like the *τὸν δέ* following.

117 A. *ταῖς δὲ δὴ κρήναις, τῇ τοῦ ψυχροῦ καὶ τῇ τοῦ θερμοῦ νάματος, πλήθος μὲν ἀφθονον ἐχούσαις, ἡδονὴ δὲ καὶ ἀρετὴ τῶν ὑδάτων πρὸς ἑκατέρου τὴν χρῆσιν θαυμαστοῦ πεφυκότος, ἐχρῶντο κ.τ.λ.*

Burnet indicates no doubt about this passage, but it is difficult to see what he makes the subject of *πεφυκότος*. If we put *ἑκατέρου* before or after *πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν*, we shall provide it with a proper subject. *ἑκατέρου* might either refer to *νάματος* or go with *ὑδάτων*, and it might either govern *ὑδάτων* or be added in an appositional way and determine the number of the participle (like *Rep.* 346 D *αἱ ἄλλαι πᾶσαι τὸ αὐτῆς ἐκάστη ἔργον ἐργάζεται*, and many other passages in verse and prose).

I cannot make out whether Stallbaum wishes to take *ἐκατέρου* in this way. His translation is against it.

118 B. *ἔλκην δὲ καὶ πλήθει καὶ γένεσι ποικίλην σύμπασιν τε τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ πρὸς ἕκαστα ἄφθονον.*

As the words stand, *πλήθει* must be constructed with *ποικίλην*, but what can *πλήθει ποικίλη* mean? Another slight transposition will help us. Read *ἔλκην δὲ καὶ γένεσι ποικίλην καὶ πλήθει . . ἄφθονον.*

Id. E. διάπλους ἐκ τῶν διωρύχων εἰς ἀλλήλας τε πλαγίας καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τεμόντες. The editors ceremoniously record a *v.l. πλατείας*, but what sense *πλαγίας* makes they fail to tell us. Read *πλαγίους*.

120 C. *νόμοι δὲ πολλοὶ μὲν ἄλλοι . . ἦσαν ἴδιοι, τὰ δὲ μέγιστα μήτε ποτὲ ὄπλα ἐπ' ἀλλήλους οἴσειν βοηθήσειν τε πάντας . . κοινή δέ, . . βουλευόμενοι τὰ δόξαντα περὶ πολέμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πράξεων.*

πράξειν is not, I think, to be added after *πράξεων*, as has been suggested, but to be substituted for it. *πράξεων* is quite superfluous. *βουλευόμενοι* should of course be *βουλευομένους*, unless Plato was confusing in his mind *νόμοι ἦσαν* and *ᾤμωσαν*, as the futures *οἴσειν* and *βοηθήσειν*, which are quite irregular after *νόμοι*, suggest. But the next sentence, *θανάτου δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, goes on properly from *νόμοι* with *μηδενὸς εἶναι κύριον*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

PROFESSOR S. A. NABER ON APOLLONIUS RHODIVS.

IN the beginning of 1906 Professor S. A. Naber devoted a long paper in *Mnemosyne* to emendations and remarks upon Apollonius Rhodius. The Professor, following Buttmann, is of opinion that Apollonius was an ignorant imitator of Homer and rebukes him for the introduction of many 'barbarous forms.' This opinion, however, though it may contain some truth, is the result of much exaggeration, for Apollonius imitated Homer as a rival rather than as a servile flatterer, and naturally and deliberately introduced many late forms into his Epic poem. I have no wish to deny that the Professor's paper contains acute and learned remarks, but certainly it does not show that familiarity with his author which might have been expected from so eminent a scholar. For instance, where a particular form is objected to for any reason, it is of no use to propose an emendation for one passage only in which it occurs and to leave other passages unnoticed. Again—a thing which will surprise most scholars—Prof. Naber has taken as his standard the smaller edition by Merkel, first published in 1851, and since stereotyped as the Teubner text, and has neglected almost all that has been done since that date. He has even neglected Merkel himself who, in his larger critical edition of 1853–54, makes many corrections of his smaller edition, and naturally so, inasmuch as the earlier and smaller edition of 1851 professes to be a recension 'ad cod. ms. Laurentianum.' In fact, as regards the text of Apollonius, the Professor seems to have been asleep for above fifty years except for an occasional glance at Professor van Herwerden, who thirty years ago published some notes on Apollonius—also in *Mnemosyne*. Whether, writing under these self-imposed limitations, it was possible for any scholar to produce a paper worthy of very serious consideration may well be doubted. Whether the present paper is of that character the reader may judge for himself. I find it difficult to preserve the respect due to a veteran scholar when he regards his own reputation so lightly. It would be more agreeable and much more congenial to myself to bestow praise, but it would be cowardly to shrink from making a protest against this method of dealing with a respectable author. It is a comparatively easy task to go back fifty years—to make again emendations that have long since become common property, to put forth as corrections what are readings of good mss., and to suggest a number of turns of language which Apollonius might have used but which evidently he did not use, but I venture to say that few scholars would give their time to such a task. These words may seem somewhat

stro
my
(wh
I ha

eme
edit
corre
On
the p

for
pass
νήπι

form
267 a
unifo
Rzac
Apol

i
subje
ago c
Herw

i
conje
suppo

i
ἐκάρει
occurs
more
or ἐνδ
be ab
referen
'nonn

i
ἀργον
take a
used in
anaph
NO.

strong, but I proceed with an attempt to justify them, and if I fail I am aware that my criticism will abundantly recoil upon my own head. The paper of Prof. Naber (whom perhaps I may without irreverence be allowed to call 'N.') is a long one and I have by no means dealt with all the passages which he discusses.

i. 18. νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἐπικλείουσιν αἰδοῖ κ.τ.λ. Here ἐπικλείουσιν is an emendation of Brunck for ἔτι κλείουσιν and he has been followed by all subsequent editors except Merkel in the Teubner text. In his ed. mai. Merkel says 'Brunckii correctio ἐπικλείουσιν evitari vix posse videtur,' and takes the word into his text. On the other hand N. upholds the mss. reading, comparing i. 59 which is not to the point. He fails to explain how πρόσθεν is consistent with ἔτι.

ii. 344. μὴ τλήτ' οἶνωοιο πάρεξ ἔτι νηὶ περῆσαι. Herwerden has proposed ἐνὶ for ἔτι. N. adopts this and would make the same change in i. 508. In neither passage however is ἐνὶ necessary and in the latter (ὄφρα Ζεὺς ἔτι κούρος, ἔτι φρεσὶ νήπια εἰδώς) the substitution of ἐνὶ spoils the epanaphora.

iv. 990. Δρεπάνη τόθεν ἐκλήσται | οὐνομα. N. objects to ἐκλήσται as 'barbara forma' comparing iv. 618 μετ' ἀνδράσι κεκλήσται. But, as we have ἐκλήστο in iv. 267 and 1202 the evil is more wide-spread than N. appears to think, and, to preserve uniformity, the better course is to read μετ' ἀνδράνιν ἐκλήσται in iv. 618, as in fact Rzsch has suggested in his *Grammatische Studien zu Apollonios Rhodios* (p. 130). Apollonius seems to be following ἐκτῆσθαι in Hom. I. 402.

i. 149. οὐδ' ἀπίθησεν | νισσομένοις. The reference is to the Dioscuri and the subject is Leda. N. proposes λισσομένοις as something new, whereas it was long ago conjectured by Meineke, as I have noted in my edition (*Oxford Classical Texts*). Herwerden would read οὐδ' ἀπίθησαν | νισσόμενοι, but the text is fairly satisfactory.

i. 283. ἄλλα δὲ πάντα πάλαι θρεπτήρια πέσσω. Here N. unnecessarily conjectures θρεπτήρι' ὅπασσας—a commonplace phrase. The text is sufficiently supported by Hom. B. 237 γέρα πέσσεμεν and Pind. *Ol.* i. 55 καταπέψαι μέγαν δλβον.

i. 367. νῆα δ' . . . ἔξωσαν πάμπρωτον ἐυστρεφεῖ ἔνδοθεν ὄπλῳ | τεινόμενοι ἐκάτερθεν κ.τ.λ. The difficulty of this passage is well known. ὄπλῳ ἐυστρεφεῖ occurs Hom. *ξ* 346, but ἔνδοθεν appears to be meaningless. Various emendations, more or less plausible, have been made, such as ἔκτοθεν by Sanctamandus, ἔμπεδον or ἐνδυκέ by Merkel, and now N. proposes ἔνδετον. Whatever our judgement may be about this word it may be gathered from the context that there is here no reference to ὑποζώματα, which were taken on board and used, as Wellauer remarks, 'nonnisi in summo periculo carina iam dissiliente et disrupta.'

i. 666. τοῦ γάρ τε καὶ εἵνεκα δεῦρο κάλεσσα and ii. 389 τῷ καὶ τε φίλα φρονέων ἀγορεύω | ἰσχύμεν. In both these passages N. proposes to read σφε for τε and to take σφε as = ὑμᾶς. It has escaped the Professor's notice that this pronoun, when used in the later Epic of the first or second person, is only used reflexively, never anaphorically. In Apollonius we find, for instance, εἰο first person (ii. 635) and εἰο

second person (i. 893). This use is probably non-Homeric, for in Hom. K 398 the better reading is *βουλεύουσι* (not *βουλεύετε*) *μετὰ σφίσιν*. It is true that in these two places of Apollonius *τε* is otiose, but that is often the case with him, e.g. again i. 1105.

i. 696, *καὶ ἀγλαὸν ἄστυ μέλεισθαι*. N. needlessly *νέμεσθαι*. The personal use of *μέλομαι* is quite common in Apollonius and other poets.

In i. 1105 N. conjectures *ἀγρομένοισιν* for *ἐγρομένοισιν*, but as Jason has just aroused his comrades from sleep the mss. reading is preferable. Still more needless is *ἐτειρεν* suggested for *ἐγειρεν* in iii. 752, where the point is that Medea is kept awake by her anxious thoughts (*μελεδήματα*).

i. 1342. *ἔολπα δέ τοι σὲ καὶ ἄλλω | ἄμφ' ἐμεῦ, εἰ τοῖόνδε πέλοι ποτέ, δηρίσασθαι*. Here N. would keep the vulgate *δηρίσασθαι* (which he appears to regard as a conjecture of his own) and no doubt in classical Greek the future or aorist with *ἄν* would be expected. Apollonius however uses the aor. infin. in a future sense not infrequently and sometimes where the future cannot be restored, e.g. ii. 293 *πελάσσαι* and ii. 1223 *μολεῖν*. It may be doubted therefore whether it is ever worth while to make the change to the future.

ii. 262 *τὸ μὲν ἔπειθ' ὄρκοισιν ἀλαλκόμεναι μενέαινον*. N. conjectures *ἀόρεσσιν* for *ὄρκοισιν* and even Merkel (ed. mai.) remarks 'mirum sane *ἔπειτα* cum dativo.' 'Mirum' indeed if that *were* the construction, but *ὄρκοισιν* is a causal dative. There is therefore no reason for any change.

ii. 1241. The phrase *ἀμοιβαίη . . . εὐνῇ* is certainly difficult, but how it is improved by N.'s substitution of *ἀνοικεῖη* for *ἀμοιβαίη* I fail to see. No epithet could be tamer.

ii. 591. *δὺς τόσον ἄψ' ἀπόρουσεν* (said of Argo between the Cyanean rocks). N. proposes *ἄψ' ἐπόρουσεν* which occurs Hom. Φ 33, but *ἀπόρουσεν* is necessary, the sense being, as Professor de la Ville de Mirmont translates, 'la violence des flots le faisait reculer deux fois plus loin qu'il n'avancait.'

iii. 321. *αὐτοὺς δ' ὑπὸ δούρασι πεπτηῶτας κ.τ.λ.* After Madvig (whom however he does not name), N. suggests *ἐπὶ* for *ὑπὸ*, but more probably *ὑπό* makes a tmesis with *πεπτηῶτας*. The phrase seems to be from Hom. ξ 474 *ὑπὸ τεύχεσι πεπτηῶτες*.

iii. 413. *οὐ σπόρον ὀλκοῖσιν Δηοῦς ἐνιβάλλομαι ἀκτὴν,
ἀλλ' ὄφις δεινοῖο μεταλδήσκοντας ὀδόντας
ἀνδράσι τευχιστῆσι δέμας.*

The sentence is difficult but the sense is fairly given by Mr. E. P. Coleridge in his translation, 'I sow for seed in the furrows not the corn of Demeter but the teeth of a dread serpent which grow into the form of armed men.' The dative apparently depends on *μεταλδήσκοντας* (which is *ἀπ. λεγ.*) and *δέμας* is an adverbial

accusative. In any case however N.'s view that *δέμας* is here combined with the dat. (as in Homer with the gen.) will not bear examination.

iv. 1133. *ἀνέυρατο*. N. rejects the form, but, as Rzach has pointed out (l.c. p. 144), it is probably an Alexandrianism.

iii. 1204. For *θείοιο τέρεν δέμας* N. asks us to substitute *θείου σφέτερον δέμας*, but the Homeric phrase which he quotes himself *τέρενα χροά* (Δ 237, Ξ 406) shows that no change is needed.

iv. 1007. *σὺν Αἰήταο κελεύθῳ*. N. interprets 'iussu' and, after mentioning Herwerden's *κελευσμῷ* himself, conjectures *κελευθμῷ*—a word of his own manufacture. But *κελεύθῳ* may very well mean 'expeditione' as in Aesch. *Ag.* 126.

iii. 1201. *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἴδε χάρον*. Out of mere caprice, it seems, N. would substitute *ἴκε* for *ἴδε*. Unfortunately the *ε* in *ἴκεω* is long. In Pind. *Pyth.* ii. 36 *ἴκοντ'* with *ι* has been variously emended.

iii. 1406. *πορφύρων, ἥ κέ σφι θωώτερον ἀντιόψωτο*. So Laur. while Guelph. has *εἰ κέ σφι*. Inferior mss. have *ἦ κέ σφι*, which has been rightly adopted by Brunck, Beck, and Wellauer. N. actually suggests *τὶ κέ σφι*!

i. 767. *ὃ καὶ δηρὸν περ ἐπ' ἐλπιδὶ θηήσαιο*. N. conjectures *κεν* for *καί*, in which he has been anticipated by La Roche. But it is unnecessary, for Apollonius, like other Alexandrian writers, often uses the optative without *ἄν* (*κεν*) in a potential sense, e.g. i. 480, iii. 99, 355, iv. 1720. See also Nairn on Herodas iii. 75.

iv. 289. *ἔνθα διχῇ τὸ μὲν ἔνθα μετ' ἴ'Ιονίνη† ἄλα βάλλει
τῇδ' ὕδωρ κ.τ.λ.*

All modern editors rightly reject *Ἰονίνη* except Merkel, who perversely thought that a part of the Euxine was called by this name. N. suggests *ῥοίνη*, which, whether good or bad, was published by Gerhard in his *Lectiones Apollonianae* so long ago as 1816, when he proposed *ῥοίνη*. Wellauer commends Gerhard's conjecture but does not venture to adopt it. Lastly, at the suggestion of Prof. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Prof. Fitch has proposed *ἡμετέρην*. But this passage requires almost a dissertation to itself.

ii. 1050. *εἰ κ' ἐπικέλσαι | μέλλετε*. So all mss. N. would read, and no doubt rightly, *εἰ γ'*, for *μέλλετε* cannot be subjunctive as Wellauer takes it. But Brunck long ago made this correction and I have adopted it in my edition. N., as usual, has his eyes fixed only on the Teubner text. Similarly in iii. 644 N. puts forward *σβέσαι* for *σβέσοι* (a solecism) omitting to mention that *σβέσαι* is a correction of Madvig, which I also have adopted and which is tolerably obvious.

iv. 673. *ἄλλο δ' ἐπ' ἄλλων | συμμιγέες μελέων*. N. reads *ἀπ'* for *ἐπ'* and is probably right. But *ἀπ'* has excellent mss. authority and has been already read by Wellauer and myself. N. also proposes *ἀπ'* for *ἐπ'* in ii. 1251 and iii. 202, perhaps rightly.

iv. 1034. N. reads *κείρατε* for *κείρετε* and certainly it is an improvement, but Wellauer has *κείρατε* from Guelph. and I have followed him.

iii. 1396. *πρὶν ὑπὸ χθονὸς ἔχνος αἶραι*. N. suggests *ἀπό* for *ὑπό*, perhaps rightly, but it was suggested by Struve in 1822, as Merkel has remarked.

i. 335. *ὅτε μῶνον ἐπιπνεύσουσιν ἀήται*, N. conjectures *ἐπιπνεύσωσιν*. No doubt the form of the future is late but not on that account to be summarily rejected. The conjecture of N. is however the reading of one Paris ms. and has been adopted by Brunck and Beck.

ii. 30. *εὐστιπτον θέτο φᾶρος | λεπταλέον*. For *εὐστιπτον* N. conjectures *εὐστικτον* on the ground that the epithets contradict one another; but surely that is not the case.

i. 253. *ἦ τέ οἱ ἦεν | βέλτερον, εἰ κ.τ.λ.* Here N. wishes to read *κε* for *τε*, likewise in iv. 916. But i. 253 follows the Homeric use, by which, if a notion of necessity or propriety is contained in the verb, the particle *ἄν* (*κεν*) is omitted. In iv. 916 this use is extended by Apollonius. The particle is also omitted with a past infin. in i. 197, iii. 585.

iii. 61. *εἰ καὶ περ ἐς Ἴδιαν ναυτίλληται*. For *καὶ* N. would read *κεν* following Brunck and Beck, though he does not name them. But it is unnecessary, compare i. 905, ii. 637, and elsewhere. The Homeric use of *εἰ* with subj. in a sentence of general meaning is extended by Apollonius.

iii. 1232. *ἔγχος τὸ μὲν οὐδέ τις ἄλλος ὑπέστη
ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, ὅτε κάλλιπον Ἡρακλῆα
τῆλε παρέξ, ὃ κεν οἶος ἐναντίβιον πολέμιζεν.*

For *πολέμιζε* (or *πιολ.*) N. conjectures *πελέμιζεν*. Quite wrongly in my judgement, for *ὃ* refers to Heracles and not to *ἔγχος* as N. apparently understands it.

iii. 1248. *ἀμφὶ δ' ἑταῖροι | πείρησαν τευχέων βεβημένοι*. N. needlessly *λελιγμένοι*. Although *βεβημένοι* does not seem to be found elsewhere as a perfect middle there is plenty of analogy for it, and who would change the easy *λελ.* into the difficult *βεβ.*?

iii. 1341. *καλέουσι δὲ κεκμηῶτες
ἐργατῖναι γλυκερόν σφιν ἄφαρ βουλυτὸν ἰκέσθαι.*

For *καλέουσι* N. proposes *χατέουσι*, which is one of the few of his original emendations that may be approved. It is true Apollonius nowhere else has *χατέουσι* followed by an infin., but it is so found in Hom. v. 280.

- iv. 1045. οὐ νηούς, οὐ πύργον ἐπίρροθον, οὐκ ἀλεωρῆν
ἄλλην, οἷόνθι δὲ προτιβάλλομαι ὑμέας αὐτούς.

The word προτιβάλλομαι is from Hom. E 879, where the meaning is 'attack.' Here it seems to mean 'fly for refuge to.' In each author the word is ἀπ. λεγ. N. suggests προτιόσσομαι which is not wanted.

Finally, Prof. Naber has in many passages proposed readings which might have proceeded from Apollonius, but which do not seem to me to be any improvement upon the accepted text. I will name some of them, i. 726 καταβλέψειας for μεταβλέψειας, i. 782 ἔβαινε for ἔβησαν, i. 872 ἕκαστος for ἕκαστοι, i. 879 περιβρομέωσι (which is also the reading of Guelph.) for περιβρομένοισι, for although in similes the subjunctive with ὅτε is common in Epic, we also find the indic., e.g. i. 881, 882, so in iv. 1299 N. needlessly proposes κλάζωσι for κλάζουσι. Again, ii. 186 πεισόμενοι for πειθόμενοι, ii. 1020 ἢ 'ν ἀγορῇ for ἢ ἀγορῇ, iii. 347 ὅττι for εἰ τι, iii. 250 δόλω for δόμῳ, iv. 10 τετελέσθαι for τελέεσθαι, 166 λείπον for λείπεν, 513 ἀφορμηθέντες for ἐφορμηθέντες, 1022 ἔπειγεν for ἔπεισεν, etc., etc.

It is a common observation that some eminent K.C. is occasionally heard to make a speech—perhaps through not having mastered his brief or for other reasons—that would ruin the prospects of a Junior. May not a similar observation be sometimes applicable in the arena of scholarship?

R. C. SEATON.

NOTES AND EMENDATIONS TO SENECA'S LETTERS.¹

v. 2. 'Don't parade philosophy: avoid asperum cultum et intonsum caput . . . et quidquid aliud ambitionem peruersa uia sequitur.' So the MSS. Hense adopts Gertz's ingenious conjecture *ambitio nempe*. I have before me a list containing some thirty examples of the use of *nempe* by Seneca. It is very definitely a dialogue particle and is used (1) to introduce the answer to a question, where it is implied that the answer is obvious ('*Why, to be sure*'), (2) to introduce a clause which shews that a statement just urged by the interlocutor though true in itself in no way weakens the original speaker's point '*Yes, but*' or '*After all said and done*,' and (3) to introduce a premiss the-truth of which the interlocutor must grant '*I take it*,' '*You know*.' For examples I may refer to *Ira* 3.26.1 quare fers aegri rabiem . . . puerorum proteruas manus? nempe quia etc.; *Ep.* 4.9 'at uictor te duci iubebit?' eo nempe quo ducis (*sc.* to death); *Ep.* 124.6 nempe uos (the Stoics) . . . dicitis. There is absolutely no parallel in Seneca to the parenthetical use which Gertz assumes here, and for which I should expect rather the concessive *sine dubio* (which indeed is opposed to *nempe* in *Helvia* 9.7).

But this is not the only objection to the emendation. Even if *nempe* could stand here, the sentence would be meaningless. Seneca's point is that all these mannerisms of the philosophers were really signs of pride, not humility. Socrates saw Antisthenes with a gown as ostentatiously ragged as that of any raw undergraduate and said 'ὥρ' σου διὰ τοῦ τρίβωνος τὴν φιλοδοξίαν.' To this 'love of show' *ambitio* clearly refers: this meaning of the word is of course common in silver Latin and especially so in Seneca. To talk of ostentation aiming at bad dress and an unkempt head, and setting about achieving this aim the wrong way seems to me to be talking nonsense, and the MSS. carefully avoid doing so (*si sic omnia*!). What they say is 'and the various other devices that have for their aim—little as one would at first sight guess it—the making of a display.' For the force of *ambitio* here assumed ('display,' instead of 'love of display') I would cp. *Ira* 3.34 'cibos, potiones, horumque causa in *ambitionem* munditias.' *Sequi* as e.g. in *Ep.* 65.6 'Quid est "propositum"? quod inuitauit artificem, quod ille *secutus* fecit'—viz., as he goes on to explain, money or glory.

¹ These notes are at present confined to the letters which I propose to include in the selection which I am preparing for Messrs. Macmillan. I should like to call the attention of scholars to two passages which

seem to me to be in sore want of medicine, though I find myself unable to do anything for them. I mean *Ep.* 12.6 (*est alter qui annos adulescentiae excludit*) and 15.8.

immo
passa
me pu
lector
77.14
mark
auaria
implic

the r
murde
deserv
printe

I
Palaeo
deal, s
Thus
efficitu
the -ur
p. 1.19
One w
across
253. 3.
the cha
TI
burn h
can bea

¹ Cp
signific

vii. 3. 'Quid me existimas dicere? auarior redeo, ambitiosior, luxuriosior, immo uero crudelior' etc. Hense's comma after *luxuriosior* is very distracting. The passage is certainly not easy to punctuate. For the meaning cp. *Ep.* 54.3 'hilarem me putas haec tibi scribere? tam ridicule facio si hoc fine quasi bona uoletudine delector quam' etc., 57.7 'nunc me putas de Stoicis dicere . . . ego uero non facio'; 77.14 'exempla nunc uirorum me tibi iudicas relaturum? puerorum referam.' A mark of interrogation must certainly stand after *luxuriosior*, and on the whole I think *auarior—luxuriosior* should be put in inverted commas: it represents the speech implied by *dicere*.

§ 5. The *meridianum spectaculum* is as bloodthirsty an affair, Seneca finds, as the real gladiatorial show. 'Yes, but the men who fight are robbers and murderers.' 'Granted,' says Seneca, 'they deserve their fate, what have *you* done to deserve being condemned to look on such a sight?' The words that follow are printed thus by Hense:

'occide, uerba, ure! quare tam timide incurrit in ferrum? quare parum audacter occidit? quare parum libenter moritur?' plagis agitur in uulnera: 'mutuos ictus nudis et obuiis pectoribus excipiant.' intermissum est spectaculum: 'interim iugulentur homines ne nihil agatur.'

He takes the sentences *plagis—uulnera, intermissum—spectaculum* as remarks by Seneca, the first one serving as a kind of stage direction. But no such direction is at all needed, as we have been told in § 4 'ferro et igne res geritur,' 'the whole business needs the swords and torches (of soldiers) to keep the combatants in the ring.' Moreover, if Seneca wishes us to understand that the spectator's desires are carried out at just this moment, why does the spectator continue with the 'mutuos ictus—pectoribus excipiant' clause, which, by the way, seems very abrupt.

I believe we can improve matters by simply inserting *et* after *moritur*. Palaeographically this is not difficult, as p L, the MSS. with which we have here to deal, show a marked tendency to misread the punctuation mark as a pair of letters. Thus it is confused with *-ur* on p. 91.22 *adtemptatur* 94.26 *circumsonatur*, 96.2 *efficitur*, 101.6 *teneatur*, 104.16 *cadentur*, in all which cases p is the offender and the *-ur* is intruded before a full stop. L offends much less often; see however p. 1.19, 67.6, 167.9. And similarly often with *us* (two exx. on p. 92; lines 10 and 12). One would certainly expect it to be confused with *et*,¹ but I have not so far come across an example, though *ur*, and *or* are so confused (cp. p on p. 115. 19, 227. 19, 253. 3, 277. 16, where *et* is wrongly omitted or inserted after *ur* or *or*). Anyhow the change is a slight one.

The whole passage will then be spoken by the spectator. 'Kill him, flog him, burn him. What? Does the wretch object to dying and want the lash before he can bear the thought of a wound? Why, they ought; to stand face to face and hack

¹ Cp. Hermes on *De Ira* p. 131 'alia manus siglum 7 addidit, quod et interpunctionis signum esse et et significare potest.'

at each other. I know 'tis the luncheon interval, and we can't have the real thing; still rather than waste the time let's have some throats cut.'

§ 8. recede in te ipse.

So the good MSS.; Hense adopts *ipsum* of c. But cp. 25. 6, *in te ipse recede* and 40. 13 *te ipse non audias*.

xii. 3. Seneca visits his country house and finds much that reminds him he is getting old—the house he built falling into decay, the trees he planted losing sap. He comes across an old man who claims to be Felicio, the bailiff's son, *cui solebas sigillaria adferre . . . delictulum tuum*. Then follow these words: 'perfecte' inquam 'iste delirat. *pupulus etiam delictum meum factus est? prorsus potest fieri: dentes illi cum maxime cadunt.*'

I believe we should read *profecto* at the outset, but that is a detail and read, e.g. by Ruhkopf, though Hense does not even mention it. The difficulty comes in the words *pupulus etiam et sqq.* Unfortunately *dentes—cadunt* which ought to make everything clear is a somewhat ambiguous phrase. The old man is losing his teeth. So was Seneca, who in *Ep.* 83. 4 speaks of a little seven-year-old boy who claims that both of them have 'eandem crism,' 'climacteric,' and the reason he assigns is that 'utriusque dentes cadunt.' The phrase regularly refers to the shedding of the milk-teeth (so in all the exx. in L. S.): could it be used of the second teeth, except by way of a joke as in *Ep.* 83. l. c.? I think not, and if I am right, then we must reject the translation 'It's quite possible he is my old playmate: his teeth are going like mine,' and take the clause *prorsus—cadunt* as referring to *pupulus*:—'He really might well be a child: he's shedding his teeth.' I believe *etiam* ought to be read *et iam*: 'he thinks that he's a boy again, and, not content with that, must be my old playmate.'

In case anyone should doubt the genuineness of *pupulus*, found again practically only in Catullus it may be well to mention that Seneca's style is full of colloquial words, such as this doubtless was, and that in particular, one may quote the words *allocutio*, *capsula*, *lancino*, *pertundo*, *sacculus*, *ueterius*, and *unguentatus* as Catullan and recurring either nowhere else or at any rate rarely elsewhere than in Seneca.

§ 7. Heraclitus said 'unus dies par omni (just below, *omnibus*) est.' This saying was differently interpreted, but the view that concerns us here, and was evidently Seneca's, is that one day was equal to another *similitudine* inasmuch as *longissimi temporis spatium* can give you nothing that you could not get in the twenty-four hours' day, viz. *luce et nocte*. Then the MSS. proceed: 'et in alternas mundi uices plura facit ista, non alias contractor alias productior. itaque sic ordinandus est dies omnis tamquam cogat agmen' etc.

Alternas mundi uices means of course the alternations of night and day: so *uices* often in Seneca's prose, and in *Thyestes* 813 *mundi uices*.¹ Gronov saw that

¹ For the use of *in*, which means 'to go and swell the total of,' cp. *Vit. Beat.* 22. 3 'quedam in summam rei parua sunt.'

the contr
sed in al
plying a
course g
their ass
another,
as if it w
owing to
sentences

xv.
take up
quote (a
passage
these qu
in 6. 7 o

Det
beneficia

Alth
conjectu
una is re
Graecum
Graecum
quite cor
are from
that the
source is
by his ac
owing to
'Epicuru
diem ian
tecum ha
loudly f
beneficia
uncomm
MSS. re
mercedul
est. Nu
g of *grac*
letters is

xv.
than ma
away wi

the contrast suggested by *non* must be *alia* (cp. *Ep.* 47. 21 'mutatur *non* in melius sed in *aliud*'), which he accordingly supplied. Buecheler and Hense follow in supplying *alia*, but assume that more words than this have fallen out—thereby of course greatly endangering the palaeographical security of the emendation. Nor is their assumption at all necessary. *Alia* ends a clause: with *alias*, we enter on another, which serves as a bridge from Heraclitus' maxim to that of 'Treat each day as if it were your last.' Unfortunately the new clause has no subject in our MSS., owing to its having been omitted by haplography before the *itaque* of the next sentence. Read then 'alias contractior, alias productior <*uita*>: itaque' etc.

xv. 9. Seneca has proved to Lucilius that the exercise of his body need not take up a large part of his time. Then, about to close his letter, he wishes to quote (according to the regular rule observed in Books I–III of the letters) a passage which has struck him in his day's reading. He has all kinds of names for these quotations: generally he regards them as a daily payment due to Lucilius, in 6. 7 one is a *diurna mercedula*. Here he begins:

Detraxi tibi non pusillum negotii; una mercedula et unum graecum ad haec beneficia accedet.

Although Hense shews no suspicion of the passage beyond citing the conjecture *munus* for *unum*, it appears to me as it stands obviously corrupt. That *una* is really equivalent to the indefinite article is bad enough: the phrase *unum Graecum* is impossible. It could only mean 'one Greek kindness,' and *munus Graecum* is not much better: *munus Graecorum* would improve matters, but it is quite contrary to Seneca's custom in these quotations to emphasize the fact that they are from the Greek: the only point he ever makes in reference to their *origin* is that they are drawn from Epicurean, not Stoic, sources. Here the question of source is duly put later on, and all Seneca is at present thinking of is, that he has by his advice about exercise really paid the debt which he regards each daily letter as owing to Lucilius: cp. especially 9. 20 where after giving an apophthegm he says: 'Epicurus too made a similar remark (uocem), quam tu boni consule, *etiamsi hunc diem iam expunxi*' and 19. 10 where after citing Maecenas he goes on 'poteram tecum hac Maecenatis sententia parem facere rationem.' In our passage *una* calls loudly for a corresponding *alter*, and I believe Seneca wrote *alterum ad haec beneficia accedet*: the letters of *alterum* got transposed (transposition is not uncommon in these MSS., p. writes *altare* for *altera* p. 203, 5) and (*g*)*raecum* of the MSS. represents the word. A slight emendation now becomes necessary after *mercedula*, so that the whole passage should read 'detraxi—negotii: una mercedula est. Nunc alterum ad haec beneficia accedet: ecce insigne praeceptum,' etc. The *g* of *graecum* probably represents the last letter of *nunc*: confusion of the two letters is extremely common in p L.

xv. 11. 'Don't be ambitious: reflect how much better off you are already than many people: finem constitue quem transire ne uelis quidem, si possis: away with delusive blessings

sp'erantibus meliora quam adsecutis. si quid in illis esset solidi, aliquando et implerent: nunc haurientium sitim concitant. mittantur speciosi adparatus.'

So Hense, after Madvig: the MSS. read *im(m)itantur* for *mittantur*. There are it is true several exx. of *mitto* being written as *mito* in these MSS., but I cannot believe that we ought to accept Madvig's conjecture, for (1) I know of no example of such a use of *mittantur* in Seneca, who would almost certainly have written *tollantur*; (2) the clause *nunc—concitant* is so brief as to be positively abrupt, although of course *implerent* has to some extent prepared the way for the metaphor; (3) the meaning 'plans,' which I imagine we must attribute to *adparatus* with Madvig's reading, is hardly, I think, to be found in Seneca. The regular meaning of the word in Seneca is something very near to that of *pompa*, a series of articles spread out so as to appeal to the eye, and such, I imagine, is about the force of Horace's *Persici adparatus*. Cp. esp. *Ep.* 94. 70, 'quis posuit in auro secretam dapem? quis... luxuriae suae pompam solus explicuit?... *adparatum* uitiorum suorum pro modo turbae spectantis expandit.'

I propose: 'nunc haurientium sitis concitant, inritant, ut speciosi adparatus.' The rewards of ambition are like the fine array at a banquet: so far from allaying the appetite, they whet it. *Inritare* is of course a *uox propria* in Seneca in connexion with *cupiditates*, *famem*, etc. For the combination with *concitare* cp. *Ep.* 85. 11, where the two words run parallel. The assonance would attract Seneca (in spite of the difference in quantity: cp. *Vit. Beat.* 3. 4 'aut inritant aut territant') and cause him to prefer asyndeton. It would of course be easy to supply *et* (especially if the MSS. shew signs of punctuation after *concitant*: see above on vii. 5), but, this kind of asyndeton is very common in Seneca: cp. 43. 3 'quaeritur, scitur,' 102. 26 'gemis, ploras,' 121. 8 'niti, quati se' (Hense is certainly wrong in bracketing *niti* there).

xxi. 10. Seneca is laying stress on the simplicity with which Epicurus lived. 'Cum adieris eius hortulos et inscriptum hortulis HOSPES, HIC BENE MANEBIS... paratus erit istius domicilii custos,' etc.

This is another of the passages which Hense prints without implying that he is dissatisfied with it, although he has to devote nearly four lines to the emendations which others have proposed. *Adieris eius*, I may note, is itself Usener's improvement on Schweighaeuser's emendation of the *a(u)dierithis* of the MSS.: it seems likely to be right. The things that still disturb one are: (1) The substantial use of *inscriptum*, for which there is no other ex. in Seneca, perhaps none at all outside Gellius, (2) the dative *hortulis* after this verbal noun, (3) the awkwardness of the zeugma *adieris—inscriptum*, (4) the repetition of *hortulis* where there is really no emphasis.

All these difficulties vanish if we read *erit* (possibly *HOC erit*, *oc* falling out after *-os*) *inscriptum in postibus*: I do not see that any serious ones take their place. The only difficulty is the *p* of *postibus*. I believe this fell out, though such

a catas
nempe
ex plan

x:
uiroru
sunt, t
quo ni

A
framev
goes o
remem
VNIVE
paralle
barbae
occulto
Ed. 1.
σπερμ

A
in Sen
eunden
Const.
you ar
quoted
Palaeo
usage
that w
istas in

A
substit
were p
philoso

xl
non ef
sufficia
T
not ple
and fa
metap
waters
what f
clearly

a catastrophe does not often befall the letter. On p. 213, 7 p V have *neme* for *nempe* similarly. At 368, 21 indeed *posse* becomes *esse* in B without any obvious explanation: on p. 5, 1 A writes *miscent* for *pmiscent*.

xxxiii. 5. 'Don't imagine you can *summatim degustare ingenia maximorum uirorum* by means of an anthology of their apophthegms. *Tota tibi inspicienda sunt, tota tractanda.* Res geritur et per lineamenta sua ingenii opus nectitur, ex quo nihil subduci sine ruina potest.'

A difficult passage. *Lineamenta* of course generally means the outline framework of a drawing or building: here it seems to mean *parts* of a whole: he goes on to say 'I don't mean that you may not examine *singula membra*, but remember, she is not a beauty cuius crus laudatur aut brachium, *sed illa cuius VNIVERSA FACIES admirationem PARTIBVS SINGVLIS abstulit.*' The nearest parallel to such a use of the word that I can find is *Nat. Quaest.* 3. 29. 3 'legem barbae et canorum nondum, natus infans habet: totius enim corporis . . . in paruo occultoque *lineamenta* sunt,' where the corresponding passage of Cleanthes (Stob. *Ecl.* 1. 372, Ritter-Preller⁸ § 500) runs ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐνός τινος τὰ μέρη πάντα φύεται ἐκ σπερμάτων ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις, κτλ.

A second difficulty is involved in the phrase *res geritur*. It is common enough in Seneca, but is always amplified into such phrases as *r. ferro g.*, *r. animo g.*, *r. intra eundem hominem g.*, and so forth. The only absolute use that I have found is in *Const.* 19. 4: 'the wise man is out of the battle, his victory is won: *uos rem geritis*, you are still fighting.' This sense will hardly do here. Various suggestions are quoted by Hense, but no one seems to have suggested an adjective for *res*. Palaeographically *magna* and *ardua* seem about equally balanced, but Seneca's usage and the rhythm are greatly in favour of the first. It is possible however that we should read *ingens* after *geritur*: cp. in any case *Ep.* 49. 9 'non uaco ad istas ineptias: *ingens negotium in manibus est.*'

A less necessary change, but to my mind one that is very desirable, is the substitution of *corpus* for *opus*. The words which follow the passage and were paraphrased above refer to bodily matters; and cp. 89. 1 'desideras . . . diuidi philosophiam et *ingens corpus* eius in membra disponi.'

xl. 2. Serapio speaks too rapidly. 'Solet magno cursu uerba conuellere, quae non effundit ima sed premit et urguit; plura enim ueniunt quam quibus uox una sufficiat.'

That *ima* is corrupt, all admit, but *una* of ϵ , which is generally accepted, does not please me much better. The meaning is quite clear, the words come so thick and fast that Serapio can't get them out: they are blocked at the exit. The metaphor is of course that of a torrent, *effundere* meaning 'to carry off' the floodwaters: cp. *eg.* Mart. 7. 36. 3 of tiles 'quae posset subitos *effundere* nimbos.' But what force are we to assign to *una*? Hardly 'altogether,' for the idea negated is clearly the idea of something which Serapio ought to do, and no one can wish him

to pour out all he has to say in a single effort. The word then must mean 'along with,' and the question at once arises 'Along with what?' Now as a matter of fact Seneca's metaphor, like many metaphors, will not bear pressing. The words *are* the torrent, but he chooses to regard them as flotsam and jetsam in that torrent: *conueller* shews this. Now the torrent flows on, whilst the trees it has uprooted get across stream and stick on rocks. Seneca then can certainly say that the river fails to carry off these trees *along with its flood-waters*, and it is just conceivable that he might write *una* instead of *una secum* or *una cum aquis suis*. But the moment we leave the metaphor and come to Serapio's delivery, we see that *una* can mean nothing: you cannot imagine a time when his words stopped but his speech went on! *Vna* then either gives an unsuitable meaning or exposes the weakness of the metaphor which Seneca is here developing: we may with confidence reject it. What is to take its place is not so easy to say, but as I and T are fairly commonly confused in these MSS., I propose to read *tamen* (*tañ* in the archetype).

§ 8. tantum festinet atque ingerat quantum aures pati possunt.

Seneca here gives rules for the right kind of delivery. If the text is correct, *tantum* is first adverbial or cognate, and then ordinary accusative. I have not noted anything like it in Seneca and believe we should change *ingerat* to *ingruat*. Cp. Quint. II. 3. 56 (in similar context): 'Some people pretend to be out of breath, tamquam inuentionis copia urgeantur, maiorque uis eloquentiae *ingruat* quam quae emitti faucibus possit' (which compare with § 2 above).

§ 9. recte ergo facies si . . . ipse malueris, si necesse est, uel P. Vinicius dicere. 'Qui itaque?' Cum quaereretur quomodo P. Vinicius diceret, Asellius ait etc.

So I read with the MSS., except that I adopt the capitals and punctuation of modern times. Something is obviously wrong: the editors content themselves with writing *Vinicius* in the first sentence and changing *uel* to *uelut* or *ut*. I must point out that this still leaves some serious difficulties. First, within a space of five lines of Teubner text we have the phrases *ut P. Vinicius dicere, quomodo P. Vinicius diceret*, and *dicere quomodo Vinicius*: all which is strangely monotonous for Senecan prose. Secondly, the question '*qui itaque?*' is hardly needed alongside the clause '*cum quaereretur*': which of the two is the more Senecan may be seen by comparing *Ep.* 29. 6 where a similar *dictum* is introduced by the words '*de cuius secta cum quaereretur, Scaurus ait*' etc. Thirdly, the interrogative adverb *qui* does not occur elsewhere in Seneca.

Starting from the certainly corrupt *qui itaque*, and bearing in mind that the interchange of *c* and *qu* is remarkably frequent in these MSS., and that there are not wanting exx. of that of *t* and *qu* (as one would a priori expect, *c* and *t* being so frequently confused), I proposed at first to read *citare*. As however Seneca does not use the word, I prefer to write *concite*, which is almost the same palaeo-

graph
where
Fabia

certain
are gi
the ve
The v
quam
and th
ment
compa
and il

§
'C

nerit
Q. Ha

W

but I

Nat. Q

'Some

ones so

sugges

is stra

at you

A

of you

But a

'Of co

the nex

wanted

so far.

W

operati

were de

lauda

betwee

to the

view w

can giv

have an

graphically (*scitae*: *con* omitted e.g. p. 86, 12; 123, 6; 125, 26). Cp. p. 245, 17 where P corrupts *aetate* into (*p*)*aetate*, and, for the word, § 12 below, where Fabianus is named as a model, who 'disputabat expedite magis quam *concite*'.

Vinicius now awaits its governing verb, and *malueris* its infinitive, for most certainly Seneca is not recommending Lucilius *dicere concitate*. Both desiderata are given and the threefold repetition of the name of Vinicius in connexion with the verb *dicere* disappears, if we read after *Vinicius* the words '*imitari quam*'. The whole passage then will run: 'et ipse malueris uel P. Vinicius <imitari quam> dicere *concite*.' It may be thought that the resemblance between *-icius* and the *-i quam* is too slight to cause an error of the kind assumed, but the above mentioned confusion of *c* and *qu* should be borne in mind, and for *-um* = *-am* I may compare p. 203, 1, where nine words fell out in p through the identification of *illam* and *illum*.

§ 10. Seneca gives the witticisms of Asellius and Varius and then goes on:

'Quidni malis tu sic dicere quomodo Vinicius? Aliquis tam insulsus interuenit quam qui illi singula uerba uellent... ait: dic numquid dicas. Nam Q. Hateri cursum... longe abesse ab homine sano uolo.'

What does the *aliquis* clause mean? Hense shews no signs of dissatisfaction, but I can make nothing of it. *Interuenit*, whatever the mood, must be like *Nat. Quaest.* 5.18.1 'inter cetera hoc quoque *aliquis suspexerit*: 'Someone might,' 'Someone could.' But this does not suit the preceding clause, one of the *quidni* ones so common in Seneca (ten in the first forty letters). These clauses regularly suggest a course, and are followed by another clause confirming or justifying the suggestion. Here it is suggested 'Better imitate Vinicius (than Serapio)': it is strange encouragement to add 'Some one will very likely come and jeer at you.'

A mark of interrogation will improve matters. 'Is anyone likely to make fun of you?' might imply 'No one will do so,' and does confirm the previous advice. But a question like this could not imply a negative: Lucilius would surely reply 'Of course some one will: some one did to Vinicius, anyhow.' And the *nam* of the next sentence, in which Seneca dismisses the lightning pace of Haterius (which wanted the break on continually, as Augustus said), is absolutely without any force so far.

We must then use the knife—but for a very slight and very common operation. Read *alius* for *aliquis* and cp. *Trang.* 9.5 'Forty thousand books were destroyed at Alexandria. "Pulcherrimum regiae opulentiae monumentum *alius laudauerit*, sicut T. Liuius, . . . : non fuit elegantiae illud"' etc. The only difference between that passage and this is that Seneca has suppressed a clause corresponding to the one there beginning *non fuit* etc., a clause in which he stated that his own view would be different. He implies this by the epithet *insulsus*, and before we can give *nam* its proper force we must supply something like: 'I say if we are to have an extreme, let it be that of Vinicius: Haterius' is frenzy.'

xlvi. 8. A description of the hardships endured by slaves waiting at a banquet.

'Alius, cui conuiuuarum censura permissa est, perstat infelix et *expectat* quos adulatio et intemperantia aut gulae aut linguae reuocet in crastinum.'

This is nonsense. If the slave has only to wait for those who are to come back next day, he is not so hard-worked after all. *Censura* implies that he has got to divide the guests, as the censors did the citizens, into classes: as the magistrates assigned people to the lists of those fit for service and those not fit, so this slave, after carefully watching their behaviour throughout the banquet, divides them into the two classes of those who deserve a second invitation and those who do not. *Spectat* then, not *expectat* is the verb required: the same mistake occurs in p or L on p. 27.3; 39.22; 75.21; 93.21, whilst at 261.19 conversely P is wrong with *spectas* for *expectas*. It seems unnecessary then to suppose that *ex* is a corruption of *ex eis*, especially as *et* immediately precedes.

§ 10. 'Treat your slave well: tam tu illum uidere ingenuum potes quam ille te seruum. Mariana clades multos splendidissime natos, senatorium per militiam auspicantes gradum, fortuna depressit: alium ex illis pastorem, alium custodem casae fecit.'

Lipsius proposed *Variana*: I am surprised that Hense* keeps to the MSS., with no further comment than that Buecheler defends their reading. The references to Buecheler in Hense are very tantalizing: no work of his is mentioned in which the remarks are published, and one is left to infer that the statements are due to private correspondence and conversation between the two scholars: cp. what is said on p. xl of the preface. One would be only too glad to know on what grounds the text could be defended: to me everything suggests the Varus disaster. *Clades* surely suits this second Cannae better than anything connected with the name of Marius: besides, *militiam* points clearly to a battle, and those who escaped from the Mario-Sullan battles would be proscribed rather than sold into slavery—the fate to which the context here clearly refers, and the fate which would certainly befall any of Varus' troops whose lives the Germans spared. Lastly, so definite a mention of military service as a preliminary to senatorial rank suits an episode of Augustus' reign far better than one of the Republican period: see Mommsen, St-R.³ 1.545 note.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Sheffield.

PIN

Mr. the first f but his ce accept Ra worth ma placed in because i added line due persp done. Fi that Mr. translates that the provisiona πονηροί . . come to M ment of impossible second pu of their fir think, be 'judgment 870 D) so Such varia

A PASSAGE OF PINDAR RECONSIDERED.

PINDAR *Ol.* ii. 63 ff.

θανόντων μὲν ἐνθάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες
 ποιῶνς ἔτισαν, τὰ δ' ἐν τᾷδε Διὸς ἀρχῇ
 ἄλιτρά κατὰ γᾶς δικάζει τις ἐχθρῇ
 λόγον φράσαις ἀνάγκη
 ἴσαις δὲ νύκτεσσιν αἰεὶ,
 ἴσαις δ' ἡμέραις ἄελιον ἔχοντες, ἀπονέστερον
 ἔσλοι δέκονται βίοντον κτλ.

Mr. Garrod's interesting discussion (in the *Classical Quarterly* for July, 1907) of the first four lines of this famous passage raises a good many controversial points, but his central objection to what may be called the most obvious rendering (if we accept Rauchenstein's αὔτις for αὐτίκ' in the first line) is one that was certainly worth making, and in attempting to meet it the whole passage may perhaps be placed in a clearer light. I have put down a few more lines than Mr. Garrod did, because it seems to me that it is just the general connexion of thought (which the added lines give) that must first be considered, in order to see the different parts in due perspective. Αὔτις must of course wait for its justification until this has been done. Firstly, as to the contrast to which μὲν points: there is no reason to think that Mr. Garrod mistook this, or supposed it to lie in τὰ δ' ἐν τᾷδε κτλ., since he translates this δέ by 'and': nevertheless it is a fact requiring cardinal emphasis that the contrast begins with ἴσαις δὲ νύκτεσσιν κτλ. Hence I conceive that a provisional outline of Pindar's meaning might be given thus: τῶν θανόντων οἱ μὲν πονηροὶ . . . ποιῶνς τίνουσιν . . . οἱ δὲ ἔσθλοι ἀπονέστερον δέχονται βίοντον. Now we come to Mr. Garrod's objection, which concerns the internal structure or arrangement of clauses in the *first* part alone of this antithesis. 'This involves an impossible inversion of the true order of ideas. It makes Pindar speak of the second punishment of guilty souls (in a new life on earth) before he says anything of their first punishment (in the world below).' For 'first punishment' it would, I think, be more accurate, as well as sufficient for the objector's purpose, to say 'judgment': for Pindar seems here to disregard the τίσις ἐν "Αἰδου (Plato, *Laws* 870 D) so as to confine the penalty to the punishment received in a second life. Such variations of detail on a common groundwork of Orphic eschatology occur

here and there according to the writer's purpose or fancy, as may be seen by comparing the several Platonic versions among themselves and with Pindar's and Vergil's. Let us say, then, that Pindar speaks of the punishment before the judgment. True: but then this *hysteron proteron* may be justified on the same principle as in other cases (unless there are any due to mere carelessness or caprice), that is, the leading thought is placed first, and emphasis overrides chronology. Here the leading thought is supplied by the antithesis that forms the framework of the whole passage: that the bad are punished, while the good are rewarded. The manner in which the punishment is brought about, though not unimpressive, is yet secondary: thus the clause τὰ δ' ἐν τῷδε . . . ἀνάγκη is subordinate in thought, and therefore placed second: it might almost be placed in brackets. And thus the chief difficulty disappears.

It remains to be seen whether the details of phraseology can be harmonized with this general view. The verbal points may be taken in order. The reasons in favour of αὐτίς for αὐτίκα are now plain enough: as Plato says (*l. c.*) καὶ πάλιν ἀφικομένους δεῦρο ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὴν κατὰ φύσιν δίκην ἐκτίσαι (I quote this passage as the simplest and most concise exposition I know of the doctrines in question, referred to by him as generally accepted from οἱ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐσπουδακότες). As for ἀπάλαμνοι, the general meaning suggested for this by our antithesis is certainly 'the wicked.' Mr. Garrod questions whether this sense (or 'sinful') is Pindaric or anywhere well established. Such a derivative meaning is not without parallel. Terms denoting moral unsatisfactoriness are apt to be allusive and euphemistic in their origin: in the course of usage they gather vituperative energy: cf. σχέτλιος, πονηρός, ῥαδιουργός, froward, caiff, etc., etc. When Mr. Pickwick called Mr. Tupman a 'fellow' he was unconsciously illustrating this linguistic tendency. And so ἀπάλαμνος, originally 'unhandy,' might acquire a sterner sense. In Solon *Fr.* 27 (3) 12 (man in the 'sixth age') οὐδ' ἔρπει ἔθ' ὅμως ἔργ' ἀπάλαμνα θέλει, Theogn. 281 δειλὴ γὰρ τ' ἀπάλαμνα βροτῷ πάρα πόλλ' ἀνελέσθαι | παρ ποδός, ἡγεῖσθαι θ' ὡς καλὰ πάντα τιθεῖ (quoted by Fennell) the meanings may be respectively 'reckless' and 'shameful,' 'dastardly' (orig. = sluggish), but that of 'wickedness' is not far off. To the next clause Mr. Garrod would give an entirely new turn by applying the verb to the defendant not the judge: δικάζει τις with acc., 'a man must plead his cause' for his misdeeds, cf. Eur. *Orest.* 580 φόνον δικάζων. The latter seems to be an isolated use for δικάζεσθαι with gen. On the other hand he questions δικάζειν τι for 'to judge an offence.' I would point out (1) that the verb is used for deciding a case, or point at issue (in the acc.) in Aesch. *Eum.* 471, 601; (2) δικάζειν (absolute) expresses the function of the judges in the underworld in several places: *Gorg.* 524 Α οὔτοι οὖν—δικάσουσιν ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι, *Rep.* 614 C ἐπειδὴ διαδικάσειαν (cf. the mid. διαδικασσάμενος, of the judged, *Phaedo* 107 D); (3) but the most obvious and tempting parallel is Aesch. *Supp.* 230

κάκει δικάζει τὰμπλακῆμαθ', ὡς λόγος,
Ζεὺς ἄλλος ἐν καμοῦσιν ὑστάτας δίκας—

becau
same
the g
(of t
rate
prob
whic
sugg
more
other
work
κτλ.
judg
anon
φράσ
altho
they
mean
of E
λόγος
and f
σε δι
in th
the s
realm
bitter
night

NO

because here the same word is used in the same connexion by a poet under the same Orphic or Pythagorean influences. The proposal to waive this analogy on the ground that (a) the true construction is perhaps δικάζειν . . . δίκας, (b) the reading (of τὰμπλακήμαθ') is uncertain, surely makes too much of accidents. At any rate the verb means 'to judge': and, granted that it has a cognate acc. δίκας, the probabilities are greatly in favour of its having also a direct object τὰμπλακήματα, which is a fairly convincing correction of the jumble in M. The same passage suggests that our τις is practically equivalent to Ζεὺς ἄλλος (i.e. χθόνιος), though more indefinite. The idea of 'dread indefiniteness' I should be prepared, with others, to accept, though one may suspect that two collateral influences are here at work: the need of reticence in alluding to chthonian powers (cf. ἄς τρέμωμεν λέγειν κτλ. Soph. O.C. 129) and the divergences of tradition respecting the judge or judges in Hades, divergences of which τις is perhaps a stately avoidance (cf. the anonymous δικάσται in the Myth of Er). Lastly, the question of ἐχθρῶ λόγον φράσαις ἀνάγκη is already largely prejudged by the foregoing considerations, and although these words are no doubt quite capable of Mr. Garrod's interpretation, they hardly offer difficulty from the other point of view. Λόγον φράσαι might mean 'to pronounce sentence,' cf. the λόγος 'Ἀνάγκης in the final scene of the Myth of Er, but more probably 'to enjoin, or demand, a reckoning,' as the converse of λόγον δίδόναι—a sense of the verb arising out of that of 'declaring authoritatively' and found with the inf., and perhaps with an acc. object in Aesch. Persae 173 μή σε δις φράσαι μήτ' ἔπος μήτ' ἔργον. Putting these results together, and reading αὐτίς in the first line, we may render the whole not too preposterously: 'After death the souls of the unrighteous do penance here once more—the wrongs done in this realm of Zeus one judgeth in the world below who demandeth a reckoning under bitter constraint—but the righteous, where their sun ever maketh day tally with night and night with day, reap a life untroubled, etc.'

W. J. GOODRICH.

AD SENECAE DIALOGOS.

Dial. I (De provid.) 3 14 p. 9 29 Hermes: 'inimicitiae potentium graues sunt: opponatur (Cato) simul Pompeio, Caesari, Crasso; graue est a deterioribus honore anteiri: Vatinio postponatur; graue est ciuilibus bellis interesse: toto terrarum orbe pro causa bona tam infeliciter quam pertinaciter militet; graue est manus sibi afferre: faciat'.

Omnibus malis, in quibus Fortunam expertus est Cato, *grauissimis* perfunctus est: qui non uni sed tribus simul potentissimis obiectus est, quem non deterior sed pessimus omnium honore anteit, cui maiores aliquanto partes in armis ciuilibus datae sunt quam ut interesset tantummodo. Vide nunc, quo minae Fortunae exeant:—'faciat'! Nonne quantocius, recordati qualem Catonis mortem descripsit Seneca (*Ep.* 24 8, 67 7 et 13, 70 19, 71 17, *Dial.* IX 16 4), restituemus '<bis> faciat'? Conferantur imprimis huius dialogi 2 11 et 12 p. 5 17: 'liquet mihi cum magno spectasse gaudio deos, dum ille uir—gladium sacro pectori infigit—. inde crediderim fuisse parum certum et efficax uulnus: non fuit diis immortalibus satis spectare Catonem semel; retenta ac reuocata uirtus est, ut in difficiliore parte se ostenderet; non enim tam magno animo mors initur quam repetitur'. *bis* propter antecedens *sibi* in *sibi* abiit ('manus sibi afferre sibi, faciat'), deinde omisum est.

Dial. III (De ira lib. I) 2 4 p. 49 1: '<> • • • tamquam aut curam nostram deserentibus aut auctoritatem contemnentibus. quid? gladiatoribus quare populus irascitur et tam inique, ut iniuriam putet, quod non libenter pereunt? contemni se iudicat et uultu, gestu, ardore a spectatore in aduersarium uertitur '<>. quicquid est tale, non est ira, sed quasi ira, eqs.

Ficto aduersario suum reddidi ('—'). In iis quae perierunt irae finitio fuit: 'iram esse cupiditatem ulciscendae iniuriae', cui finitioni tria obiciuntur: 'iram moueri interdum aut *non* accepta iniuria (horum prior pars aequae interit), aut *nondum* (3 1), interdum uindictae cupiditate carere' (3 2).

Dial. III (De ira lib. I) 12 1 p. 59 1: 'Quid ergo?' inquit 'uir bonus non irascitur si caedi patrem suum uiderit, si rapi matrem?' Non irascetur, sed uindicabit, sed tuebitur. quid autem times, ne parum magnus illi stimulus etiam sine ira pietas sit? aut dic eodem modo: 'quid ergo? cum uideat se *ca* ri patrem suum filiumue, uir bonus non flebit nec linquetur animo?' quae accidere feminis uidemus, quotiens illas leuis periculi suspicio perculit.

Seneca
facta

praec
suppl
ira ec

rem n
utend
pliciu

conue
indign
nulla

tollen
esse u
'illoru
dialog

plurin

homin

irasee
ponen
neglec
illis ir

non es
corpor
conci
aeta
'sene

1 V.
modo a
enim, ro
ob adm
duos p

Pro 'secari' infelicitate 'necari' coniecerunt Wolters et editor. Hoc enim uult Seneca: ob eandem irasci aequae infirmitatis (§ 4) indicium esse atque flere ob factam medicinam (*Dial.* XII 2 2 p. 341 25: 'urere ac secare').

Dial. III (*De ira* lib. I) 16 5 p. 63 22: et cum ceruicem noxio imperabo praecidi et cum parricidas (—am *edd. ueteres*) insuam culleo et cum mittam in supplicium militare et cum Tarpeio proditorem hostemue publicum inponam, sine ira eo uultu animoque ero, quo serpentes et animalia uenenata percutio.

Lipsius, quamuis recte obiectum desiderans, tamen dum 'militarem' proponit, rem non absoluit, cum desideretur etiam culpae indicatio; itaque fortiore remedio utendum esse puto et scribendum 'latronem'. (*Dial.* VII 19 3 p. 217 4 'ad supplicium acti' = in crucem sublatis).¹

Dial. III (*De ira* lib. I) 16 6 p. 64 4: nam si bono uiro ob mala facinora irasci conuenit, et ob secundas res malorum hominum inuidere conueniet. quid enim est indignius quam florere *improbos* quosdam et eos indulgentia fortunae abuti, quibus nulla potest satis mala inueniri fortuna?

W. Gemollio 'improbos' inserenti potius adstipularer, quam Gertzio aut 'eos' tollenti, aut 'quos damnes' corrigenti: in ipsis enim quae traduntur uerbis nihil esse uidetur quod suspicionem moueat; sed uerisimilius est ante 'florere' excidisse 'illorum' (per compendium, cf. Gertzii excurs. crit. pp. 412 sqq. in editione dialogorum, Hauniae 1886).

Dial. III (*De ira* lib. II) 5 3 p. 76 8:—et uoluptate multa perfruuntur plurimumque ab iratorum uultu absunt, per otium saeui.

Gertzii coniecturae 'per iocum' fauet *Ep.* p. 432 14 Hense: 'homo, sacra res homini, iam per lusum ac iocum occiditur'.

Dial. IV (*De ira* lib. II) 10 1 p. 80 3: Illud potius cogitabis, non esse irascendum erroribus. quid enim, si quis irascatur in tenebris parum uestigia certa ponentibus? quid, si quis surdis imperia non exaudientibus? quid, si pueris, quod neglecto dispectu officiorum ad lusus et ineptos aequalium iocos spectent? quid, si illis irasci uelis, *qui*, quod aegrotant senescunt, fatigantur?

In loco uarie temptato asyndeton trimembre 'aegrotant senescunt fatigantur' non est tollendum, cf. *Dial.* V 9 3 p. 118 17: 'debemus—cauere lassitudinem corporis: consumit enim quidquid in nobis mite placidumque est et acria concitat.—ob eandem causam iracundiores sunt uoletudine aut aetate fessi'. Quem locum respiciens et alterum qui legitur IV 19 4 p. 89 12: 'senes difficiles et queruli sunt, ut aegri et conualescentes et quorum aut

¹ V. cl. Postgate quem offendit inaequalis quodammodo atque sibi impar sententiarum enuntiatio—cur enim, rogat, cum in prioribus particulis unus tantum ob admissum facinus poenas capite pendat, in ultimo duos *proditorem—hostem* pendere uidemus?—pro-

ponit: 'et cum mittam in supplicium <proditorem rei> militaris et cum Tarpeio hostem publicum inponam', coll. *Liv.* II 59: 'inunctus haud falso in proditorem exercitus militaris disciplinae' (mox sequitur supplicium).

lassitudine aut detractio sanguinis exhaustus est calor', ita suppleuerim: 'quid si <quer>ulis irasci-uelis, quod aegrotant senescunt fatigantur?' 'quod' non sicuti in antecedentibus (irasci pueris quod—spectent) ad 'irasci' referendum est, quod uetat modus indicatiuus, sed ad 'querulis'; neque aliter fieri potest: quis enim sanus ob hoc solum homini irascatur quod aegrotet uel senescat uel fatigetur? Postquam 'querulis' in 'illis' deprauatum est, ortum est—neque causa latet—quod in *L* legitur: '*qui aegrotant*'.

Dial. IV (De ira lib. II) 27 2 p. 96 7: non enim nos causa mundo sumus hiemem aestatemque referendi: suas ista leges habent, quibus diuina exercentur.

Gertz, qui in Studiis suis criticis p. 93 'diuina' incluserat, in editione proposuit 'diuina <omnia>'; Madvig 'cui> diuina' supplens aut tautologiam induxit, si 'leges' et 'uis diuina' idem sunt, aut, si minus, tenebris omnia inuoluit. Nisi cum editore auctoris negligentiam suspicari malis, uide ne satius sit scribere 'quibus deuincta exercentur'; cf. *Dial. VI 18 1 p. 176 18*: puta nascenti me tibi uenire in consilium: 'intraturus es urbem dis, hominibus communem, omnia complexam, certis legibus aeternisque deuinctam', indefatigata caelestium officia uoluentem'.

Dial. IV (De ira lib. II) 36 6 p. 107 20: maximum enim illos malum cepit et omnia exsuperans uitia. alia paulatim intrant, repentina et uniuersa uis huius est.

Gertzii coniecturam 'illa' uel 'alia: illa' iure non recepit editor: 'alia' enim significat 'cetera', cf. quae subsequuntur 'omnes alios affectus', *Dial. V 4 5 p. 112 28*: 'alia animi mala' (opp.: iracundia), *de Ben. III 11 3 p. 61 22*: 'omnium parentium unum erat beneficium—; alia diuersa sunt'.

Dial. V (De ira lib. III) 4 4 p. 112 22: non uis ergo admoncam eos, qui iram <in> summa potentia exercent et argumentum uirium existumant et in magnis magnae fortunae bonis ponunt paratam ultionem, quam non sit potens, immo ne liber quidem dici possit irae suae captiuus? non uis admoncam, quo diligentior quisque sit et ipse se circumspiciat, alia animi mala ad pessimis quosque pertinere, iracundiam etiam eruditus hominibus et in alia sanis inreperere?

<in> ex *L* restituendum uidetur: nam re uera homines praepotentes (reges, tyrannos) indicasse Senecam tam e uerbis 'magnae fortunae' colligas quam uel praecipue ex exemplis quae et praepotentium et disertorum irae sequuntur c. 16 3, c. 17 1 *sqq.* (p. 126 7 *sqq.* et 24 *sqq.*): 'atqui plerique sic iram quasi insigne regium exercuerunt, sicut Darius—. at quanto Xerses facilius! eqs'. 'Haec barbaris regibus feritas in ira fuit, quos nulla eruditio, nullus litterarum cultus inbuerat: dabo tibi ex Aristotelis sinu Alexandrum—'. De locutione 'iram exercere' cf. locum laudatum (p. 126 7) et V 8 3 p. 117 6: 'causas irascendi non

¹ Ne editoris annotatione 'deuincta Gertz et Madvig' in errorem inducatur, monendus est lector Madvigium probauisse quidem Gertzii coniecturam (Gertz. Studd. Critt. p. 113: 'omnia complexam, certis legibus aeternisque deuincta indefatigata c.o.u.')

ipsam tamen (Aduu. Critt. II p. 356) sic uerba citauisse: '—omnia complexam, certis legibus... deuincta'; ut appareat illum, dum ad Gertzii interpolationem parum attendit, aliud probauisse, aliud prorsus ipsum uoluisse.

inuenit nec uitium suum exercet.' 'In potentia' = dum potentes sunt (cf. VII 22 1 p. 220 8: 'in diuitiis'). De toto cf. *de Clem.* I 13: 'In hac tanta facultate rerum non ira me ad iniqua supplicia compulit,—non ipsa ostentandae per terrores potentiae dira, sed frequens magnis imperiis gloria'.

Dial. V (*De ira* lib. III) 5 6 p. 114 1: nihil est similitudinis grauius: has ira conciliat; nihil est bello funestius; in hoc potentium ira prorumpit; ceterum etiam illa plebeia inerme et sine uiribus bellum est.

Bentleio 'sine uiris' scribenti de corruptela consentiendum est: quis enim similitudinis, quas tamquam grauissimas denotauerit, uires derogat? Sed requiritur quo designetur hoc tantum a bello distare similitudines, quod funestae non sint, quam ob rem praestare uidetur 'sine uulneribus'.

Dial. V (*De ira* lib. III) 14 3 p. 123 27: controuersiam illi facere de gloria debuit et reuocare iactum eqs.

Lipsii coniecturam 'ictum' tantum non receperunt Gertz et Hermes ('rectius ut uidetur de sagitta'). Conferatur tamen *Verg. Georg.* ii 123: 'aera uincere summum Arboris haud ullae iactu potuere sagittae', qui locus quamquam diuersus est, cum illic de spatio transacto agatur, hic de mittentis certa manu (cf. *Sen. Herc. Oet.* 161: 'Parthus Cnossiacis certior ictibus'), tamen de uerbi ipsius legitimo usu dubitari non potest. Ceterum tota haec apostropha us. 23–33: 'dii illum male perdant — laudatum est quam missum' interlocutori danda esse uidetur: aliena est a mente Senecae, in hoc solum nitentis ut iram inhiberi et *debere* persuadeat, et *posse* demonstret exemplis.

Dial. V (*De ira* lib. III) 18 4 p. 128 13: (C. Caesar) adeo impatiens fuit differendae uoluptatis,—ut in xysto—quosdam ex illis (senatoribus et equitibus) cum matronis atque aliis senatoribus ad lucernam decollaret.

'cum' = 'coram' cf. *Ep.* 25 6 (p. 78 20 Hense): 'dum te efficis eum, cum quo peccare non audeas'.

Dial. V (*De ira* lib. III) 28 5 p. 138 11: quidam uero non tantum iustas causas standi contra nos, sed etiam honestas habent: alius patrem tuetur, alius fratrem, alius patriam, alius amicum; his tamen non ignoscimus id facientibus, quod nisi facerent improbaremus.

Suspectum uidetur 'patriam' (*A.* uulgo inepte 'patruum'), cum et minus apte inter officia, quae singulis hominibus praestantur, etiam patriae mentio fiat, neque qui patriam tuetur 'contra nos stet', neque ei quisquam (cuius cui) non ignoscat: nam de hoste aliquo suae patriae defensore cogitare nos uetant sequentia: 'at me hercules uir magnus ac iustus fortissimum quemque ex hostibus suis et pro libertate ac salute patriae pertinacissimum suspicit'. Itaque restituendum uidetur 'patruum', sed una littera adiecta: 'patrōnum'.

Dial. VI (ad Marc.) 7 1 p. 159 20: 'At enim naturale desiderium suorum est'. quis negat, quam diu modicum est? nam discessu, non solum amissione carissimorum necessarius morsus est eqs.

'ex' quod ante 'discessu' seruant codd. dett., ex 'et' ortum esse suspicor.

Dial. VI (ad Marc.) 16 1 p. 172 1: par illis (feminis), mihi crede, uigor, par ad honesta, libeat, facultas est.

'libera', quod pro 'libeat' in dett. traditur, si uera est lectio, pro asyndeto habendum est 'ad honesta libera', uidetur tamen ex 'libeat' esse quasi emendatum, quod quamquam negant uiri docti; sic nude poni posse pro 'si libeat' uel 'libeat modo' similibus, coniecturis non temptare praestat; cf. X 15 1 p. 302 2: 'per illos non stabit, quominus plurimum quantum, coeperis, haurias'.

Dial. VI 17 p. 174 10-18 p. 176 15: Huius capitis ordinem qui uiri docti praeuente Madvigio per ultimae partis transpositionem—quamquam alius aliter—restituisse sibi uisi sunt, non satis ut opinor ipsarum partium iustam successionem et quasi aequabilitatem attenderunt:

(a)	(b)
17 2: 'si quis <i>Syracusas</i> petenti diceret: "omnia incommoda—ante cognosce, deinde ita nauiga eqs."	17 6: 'dicit <i>omnibus nobis</i> natura: "neminem decipio. tu si filios sustuleris, poteris habere formosos, et deformes poteris eqs."

(a)	(b)
17 6: 'post hanc denuntiationem si quis dixisset intrare se <i>Syracusas</i> uelle, satisne iustam querellam de ullo nisi de se habere posset, qui non incidisset in illa, sed prudens sciensque uenisset?'	17 7: 'post has leges si liberos tollis, omni deos inuidia liberas, qui tibi nihil certi spoponderunt.'

Apparet nullo modo quae sub (b) notata sunt alio relegari posse quin pereat mutua relatio quae est inter (a) et (b), pereat manifesta conexio quae est inter uerba 'neminem decipio' et ea quae praecedunt 'qui non incidisset in illa sed prudens sciensque uenisset', pereat quoque duplex imaginis usus, qua primum filios generandi tollendi educandi aleam cum dubia peregrinatione comparans hanc parentium uitae partem tractat Seneca, tum ad totius uitae condicionem illustrandam pergit (18 1: 'Ad hanc imaginem aegidum totius uitae introitum refer eqs.'), ut demonstret neque in uita liberorum amissiones neque ipsam uitam esse recusandam: nam ut in illis procreandis ipse consultus es a natura, uitae condiciones tibi proponenti, ita de ipsa uita tua consulti sunt parentes, 'qui cum condicionem uitae nossent, in hanc nos sustulerunt (18 fin.)'.

In errorem inducti non essent uiri docti, si ex more suo scripsisset Seneca (17 6) 'nunc (= nunc autem) dicit nobis natura' (cf. VI 20 4 p. 182 8: 'at nunc', 20

6 p. 183 3: 'nunc', item IX 10 7, XII 5 2, 15 3 (=pp. 262 25, 344 3, 362 25), sed 'nunc' omittitur etiam III (= *De ira* I) 16 4 p. 63 12: 'si intrassem ualetudinarium, non idem inperassem omnibus per diuersa aegrotantibus; (*interpunge*): uaria in tot animis uitia uideo et ciuitati curandae adhibitus sum: pro cuiusque morbo medicina quaeratur.'

Dial. VI (ad Marc.) 23 5 p. 188 23: Fabianus ait—puerum Romae fuisse statura ingentis uiri † ante; sed hic cito decessit, et moriturum breui nemo non prudens dixit.

'ante' transponendum uidetur: 'et m. b. nemo prudens <non ante> dixit'.

Dial. IX (De tranq. animi) 11 6 p. 266 18: morbus est, captiuitas, ruina, ignis: nihil horum repentinum est; sciebam, in quam tumultuosum me contubernium natura cluisset. totiens in uicinia mea conclamatatum est;—multos ex iis, quos forum, curia, sermo mecum contraxerat, nox abstulit et † iunctas sodalium manus copulatas interscidit.

'est' (post 'morbus') aut radicitus euellendum est,—de nominatiuis in enumeratione cf. ex. gr. *Ep.* 77 6 p. 271 10: 'cibus, somnus, libido, per hunc circulum curritur'—, aut in 'exilium' corrigendum (uulgo 'enim' legitur, non 'est'), quamuis audaci coniectura id adsequemur ut 'nox' non tempus moriendi indicet—de morte enim iam satis superque in antecedentibus—sed quo in exilium abierint amici (*Ouid. Trist.* I 3): neque iam, quod editori, cui Schultessii coniectura 'abstulit; tot licitor s. manus' placebat, uidebatur, uocula illa 'tot' necessaria erit, ne apta quidem; nam quamuis multos ille exules uiderit ex eorum numero cum quibus laxiore alicuius commercii (fori, sermonis, similibus) uinculo continebatur, ex artiore familiaritate sodalium si unum et alterum desiderauit, sat multi sunt.² Ceterum ultima uerba distinxerim 'et iunctas sodalium manus, copulatas, interscidit'. De asyndeti forma simul et gradatione cf. V 5 3 p. 113 19: 'accusanda est apud nos, damnanda'; 'iungi copularique' e *Cic. de Or.* I § 222 citauit Wesenberg.

Dial. X (De breu. uitae) 15 3 p. 302 8: solemus dicere non fuisse in nostra potestate, quos sortiremur parentes, forte hominibus datos: nobis uero ad nostrum arbitrium nasci licet. nobilissimorum ingeniorum familiae sunt: elige in quam adscisci uelis.

Nescio cur editor 'hominibus' pro 'nobis' scripserit: nolo suspicari ut esset cui opponeretur sequens 'nobis uero'; nam primum quidem non recte haec inter se

¹ I. Mueller *Kritische Studien* III p. 24 '—nicht selten unterlässt es Seneca dem Verständnisse des Lesers durch Partikeln entgegen zu kommen, und besonders sind es die Adversativpartikeln, die er gerne erbringt, auch wo sie nicht ersetzt werden durch eingermassen scharf hervortretende Antithesen.'

² *Ep.* 66 36 p. 207 5: 'morbum magnum, exilium' (quamquam propter sequens 'tormentis' (us. 13) non

spernenda uidetur Michaelis coniectura (*Mnem. N.S.* XVII p. 172) 'eculeum'), 82 14 p. 304 21: 'morti, exilio, malae ualetudini', 91 8 p. 384 21, quem locum sic lego: 'exilia, tormenta, morbi, bella, naufragia: <haec> meditare'; interpungendum est inter 'tormenta' et 'morbi', cf. 71 5 p. 229 22: 'et torqueri—et aegrotare—'; de nominatiuis cf. locum laudatum (*Ep.* p. 271 10).

opponuntur, et 'nobis uero licet' significat: 'sed non ita est; nobis licet—', cf. XII 10 10 p. 355 15 (de Apicio, ueneno uitam finienti, cum in sestertio centies egenum se putaret): 'sestertium centies aliquis extimuit et, quod alii uoto petunt, ueneno fugit! illi uero tam prauae mentis homini ultima potio saluberrima fuit: tunc uenena edebat bibebatque, cum immensis epulis non delectaretur tantum, sed gloriaretur', de Ben. I 14 2 p. 19 11: 'Nemo haec ita interpretetur, tamquam reducam liberalitatem—; illa uero (=immo), in quantum libeat, exeat', IV 2 3 p. 86 24: '—ordinis tantum existimas mutationem? Ista uero confusio est—' Ep. 98 6 p. 451 18: 'nec ideo praecipio tibi neglegentiam: tu uero (=immo) metuenda declina'.

Dial. XI (Ad Polyb. de cons.) 4 1 p. 315 11: nihil umquam ulli parcut (fata) nec remittunt; facilius enim nos inferis dolor iste adiciet quam illos nobis reducet.

Neque 'inferis' (pro 'illis') recta emendatio est, cum nemo inferos, sed carissimos tantum suos desideret, neque 'fletis' (Schultess) necessaria: qui sint 'illi' facile ex antecedentibus 'nihil ulli parcut' intellegitur et, ut in re tristi, humanius tecte significatur. Notandus etiam chiasmus 'nos illis—illos nobis'.

Dial. XI (Ad Polyb.) 14 3 p. 330 22 (Claudius loquens inducitur): 'uides omnes has imagines, quae impleuere Caesarum atrium? nulla non harum aliquo suorum incommode insignis est; nemo non ex istis in ornamentum saeculorum refulgentibus uiris aut desiderio suorum tortus est aut a suis cum maximo animi cruciatu desideratus est. quid tibi referam Scipionem—?' (post alios nonnullos reuertitur ad suos p. 331 25:) 'sed contentus nostrae domus exemplis ero'.

Tam propter antecedens 'tortus est', quam quo melius digressio notetur, praestare uidetur: '—desideratus. et quid tibi r. Scipionem?'

Dial. XII (Ad Heluiam de cons.) 10 3 p. 353 23: ista (sc. epulas) si quis despicit, quid illi paupertas nocet? si quis concupiscit, illi paupertas etiam prodest: inuitus enim sanatur et, si remedia ne coactus quidem recipit, interim certe, dum non potest uelle, nolenti similis est.

Pro 'illa' Madvigium secutus 'uelle' scripsit Hermes, quod cum obscurius uisum esset Gertzio, is dederat 'dum non potest illa (i.e. remedia) nolle, uolenti similis est'. Sed, ni fallor, pura puta sunt omnia, dum 'illa' non ad remedia referas sed ad 'ista' (= epulas): de uerbo 'posse' cum obiecto cf. *Apulei Apol.* c. XVIII (p. 21 Helm): '(paupertas) delicias uentris et inguinum neque uult ulla neque potest' et c. XX (p. 23 H.): 'neminem nostrum pauperem esse qui superuacua nolit, possit (*Casaub.* pro 'poscit') necessaria.' Cf. quae annotauimus ad Ep. 26 2 (*C.Q.* I p. 205).

Potterdam.

A. J. KRONENBERG.

PERICLES AND CLEON IN THUCYDIDES.¹

NOT the least pleasure in reading a book so vital and imaginative as Mr. Cornford's lies in the vitalising effect it has on the imagination of the reader. The results may or may not be correct: Mr. Cornford may or may not agree with them: but it is perhaps the best of compliments to a writer that he should produce such an effect at all. In the present instance his masterly analysis of the character and significance of Cleon as an actor in Thucydides' historic drama has suggested an interpretation of Pericles' position in the tragedy, which, though somewhat different from Mr. Cornford's own estimate of that great figure, is yet in accordance with his general conception of the work as a whole, designed to show Retribution following on overbearing Ambition and overweening Desire. From the time of Grote this conception has been familiar enough in outline, but Mr. Cornford fills it in with a wonderful richness of detail and illustration, and in particular draws a striking parallel with the vast scheme of Retribution in the *Oresteia*.

But throughout he seems to discredit such a conception of history from the point of view of truth and accuracy. He calls it 'mythical'; 'imaginative' it undoubtedly is; but does imagination always imply inaccuracy? Is it not true as a matter of fact that Athens *was* led to the ruinous war with Sparta by her desire for larger empire and greater wealth? Such questions, already raised by Dr. Postgate in the October number of this Review, must be pressed home. And if Athens was so led, is not this the most important fact in the whole affair? Mr. Cornford would admit that however much the modern way of speaking about 'causes' in history may differ from the Thucydidean, yet the modern historian, as the ancient, must deal at bottom, if he goes to the bottom, with the desires and passions of actual men. Now it seems to me that the modern method runs the risk of obscuring these behind the talk of 'laws' and 'forces,' though such laws are, and are even known to be, nothing but shorthand symbols for them and their results. The Greek way of putting it stands clear of this danger and reaches, as the Greek genius usually did, instinctively to the root of the matter. Solon's 'acute observation of the habits of merchants' (p. 66), viz., 'that they are not accustomed to bring their wares to places where they can get nothing in exchange,' is really far clearer than any statement of ours about the 'necessity that imports should

¹ See *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, F. M. Cornford.

balance exports.' So with the question here. What was the cause of the Peloponnesian war? Mr. Cornford answers in effect: 'Not the alarm of Sparta, and not the policy of Pericles, but simply the trade-necessities of Athens. Megara was the centre of strife, because Megara was on the trade-route to Sicily, and therefore a necessity for Athens.' But why, we ask further, was it a necessity for Athens to take by force what was not hers, however rich and tempting? Has Mr. Cornford any answer to this, the deepest question of all? We believe Thucydides had one. It was a necessity for Athens because she had set her heart on an ideal of culture, leisure, and beauty for herself, based on the wealth and toil of others. And this ideal was the ideal of Pericles. The necessary basis might be kept in the background, but the man who took the tribute of the allies for the building of the Parthenon, the man who went on his way unmoved when the scrupulous cried aloud that Athens was not an adventuress to be tricked out in stolen jewels (Plut. *Per.* c. 12), the man who called Aegina the eyesore of the Peiraeus (*ibid.* c. 8) and never rested till the rich commercial centre was made a tributary, that man knew well enough what he was about, he knew what were the sinews of culture as well as of war, he knew the needs of his State when he laid hands on Megara for her growing population. His own words may furnish illustration. The increase in empire has gone hand in hand with the furnishing of the city (Thuc. ii. 37. 4, and again c. 64. 4). It is the power of the city that has made it the market for the world's goods (ii. 38). It does not seem necessary, therefore, to take the paradoxical view that the statesman's hand was forced in the matter of Megara by the trading mob, and that Aristophanes and Thucydides were misled when they pointed to him as the man 'who drove the Athenians to the war.' Mr. Cornford has really nothing to bring forward in defence of this except that Pericles speaks of the Megarian decree as possibly 'seeming a little thing.' And even if it did seem so to him as well as to his critics (a thing he does not say), that may well have been in view of the many resources in his fertile brain: if he could not have carried his point about Megara then and there, we may be sure he would have found other ways for Athens to strike at foreign wealth.

Undoubtedly such a stroke was justified in his own eyes. Athens was the school of Hellas, and the tributaries should be proud to contribute. Was it justified in the eyes of Thucydides? He lets Pericles state his own case, he gives the Periclean ideal in all its ineffaceable splendour; but, and this is our great contention, he is careful to set down also the violence that the Periclean policy involved, the selfishness and the tyranny, the hatred on the side of the subjects, and the contempt of ordinary morality in the hearts of the sovereigns. Further, he sets side by side, very quietly, but, once we realise it, with startling effect, the two stages of that policy: the first embodied in a man of supreme ability and refinement, the second in a brutal nature, where the evil and the danger, not easily to be discerned before, appear at last in their naked deformity. Cleon is the successor of Pericles, and the succession, once grasped, is significant enough to arouse and alarm the historic conscience. Thucydides, I believe, did not intend

this ef
was
ready-
the tru
active
unobtr
prelim
should
'This
followe
N
given
case th
seemir
the m
notew
chapte
the ne
hardly
A
to corr
P
positio
of his
point,
(... I
την πα
πόλεμ
(B
propos
(C
advisin
to star
first m
gave
γυγνόμ
τὸν χρ
N
with t
C
and Cl
assem
influen

this effect to jump to our eyes from the first. His history, a possession for ever, was to do its full work slowly. Like Plato, he wished not to impose his opinion ready-made upon his readers, but so to present the facts that, after due meditation, the true view should grow up, as it were with its own life, in a mind that was active itself. Hence, as here, he works for the most part indirectly and unobtrusively, refraining too from all comment of his own. Yet his own preliminary statement about the rise of the Athenian empire is very strong, and should not be minimised. Speaking of the revolt of Naxos (i. 98 fin.) he says: 'This was the first allied city that was *enslaved contrary to the terms*, and the rest followed one after another, each in its turn.' (παρὰ τὸ καθεστηκὸς ἐδουλώθη.)

Now let us turn to the protagonists themselves. At the outset Pericles is given a curious double introduction, and Cleon has exactly the same. In each case the second introduction is an insistent echo of the first, and yet, far from seeming a mere repetition, it is calculated to strike us as the first direct mention of the man. This is noticed by Mr. Cornford for Cleon (p. 118), and it is just as noteworthy for Pericles. The effect, each time, is gained partly by the lapse of chapters between the two passages, partly by the turn of phrase in the second, and the net result is a singularly deep and clear 'first impression,' made on us, we hardly know how, just as it is made in life.

And these double descriptions, worked out with this subtle care, will be found to correspond in a striking way.

Pericles. (a) (Thuc. i. 127.) Sparta, we are told, tried to undermine the position of '*Pericles, the son of Xanthippus*,' 'because, *being the most powerful man of his time, and the leader of the State*, he opposed the Lacedaemonians at every point, and would not allow the Athenians to give in, but drove them to the war.' (. . . Περικλέα τὸν Ξανθίππου . . . ὃν γὰρ δυνατώτατος τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἄγων τὴν πολιτείαν ἡγαντιοῦτο πάντα τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ οὐκ εἶα ὑπέκειν, ἀλλ' ἐς τὸν πόλεμον ὥρμα τοὺς Ἀθηναίους.)

(b) Then, after twelve chapters (i. 139 fin.), and in direct connection with the proposal to rescind the Megarian decree:

'Various speakers came forward and spoke in favour of either view, some advising war, others urging that the decree ought to be rescinded, and not allowed to stand in the way of peace. *And Pericles, the son of Xanthippus, at that time the first man in Athens, the most powerful as a speaker and a leader, stood forward and gave the following advice.*' (καὶ παριόντες ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ ἔλεγον, ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρα γιγνόμενοι ταῖς γνώμας, . . . καὶ παρελθὼν Περικλῆς ὁ Ξανθίππου, ἀνὴρ κατ' ἐκείνους τὸν χρόνον πρῶτος Ἀθηναῖων, λέγειν τε καὶ πράσσειν δυνατώτατος, παρήνει τοιαύδε.)

Now let us turn to Cleon. The first mention of him is put in direct connection with the proposal to rescind the Mytilenean decree.

Cleon. (a) (iii. 36 fin.) 'Various views were expressed by individual speakers, *and Cleon, the son of Cleainetus* (who had carried his proposal for death in the previous assembly), *always the most violent man in the city, and at that time far the most influential with the democracy, stood forward once more and spoke as follows.*'

(ἄλλα τε γινώμαι ἀφ' ἐκάστων ἐλέγοντο καὶ Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, ὅσπερ καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἐνεκικέκει ὥστε ἀποκτείνειν, ὦν καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα βιαίотος τῶν πολιτῶν τῷ τε δήμῳ παρὰ πολὺ ἐν τῷ τότε πιθανώτατος, παρελθὼν αὖθις ἔλεγε τοιαύδε.)

(δ) Then, a long while after (iv. 21), in connection with the refusal of the Athenians to make peace after Sphacteria because 'they coveted something more' (Mr. Cornford's version):

'They were urged forward above all by Cleon, the son of Cleainetus, a man who was the popular leader at that time, and the most influential with the multitude.' (μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐνήγε Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, ἀνὴρ δημαγωγὸς κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ὦν καὶ τῷ πλήθει πιθανώτατος.)

Once put these passages side by side, and the significant likenesses should not escape attention, nor yet, no doubt, the significant changes:—βιαίотος and πιθανώτατος for λέγειν καὶ πράσσειν δυνατώτατος, δημαγωγὸς for ἄγων τὴν πολιτείαν. Cleon has succeeded in a sense to the position of Pericles: how far has he succeeded to his policy? It will also be observed that the first mention of Cleon corresponds most closely with the second mention of Pericles. This, I take it, is because Thucydides wishes to emphasise the parallel between the two assemblies. Each meeting is for reconsideration: Pericles will not allow the rescinding of the harsh decree against Megara: Cleon tries to prevent the cancelling of the barbarous one against Mytilene. Megara is the first great instance of attack on a neighbour city for her wealth: Mytilene the first of murderous cruelty towards a coveted island. It may also be worthy of note that just as Pericles breaks off the negotiations about Megara by extravagant counter-demands which he knows the Spartans will not accept, so Cleon stops the bargainings for peace after Pylos by demanding Troezen, Achaea, and the key-ports of Megara again. Each speaker asserts that to yield on the disputed point will be taken as a fatal sign of weakness: the Peloponnesians will dictate their own terms (i. 140 fin.): the allies will revolt with one accord (iii. 39. 7).

But there are deeper correspondences than these, strange correspondences of spirit, even of phrase, and here the parallels are between the one speech of Cleon and the great three in which Pericles reveals himself.

Both leaders stand up to defy the popular mood. In Cleon's speech 'there is not a touch of the gross or cringing flatterer; it is not the Cleon of Aristophanes. He breaks out at once in violent denunciation of the sovereign people' (Mr. Cornford, p. 114). Does not Thucydides mean us to think of the 'lightnings' of former days wielded by a coarser hand?

The first words of Pericles are these (i. 140):

'I still keep to the opinion I have always held: that we must not yield to the Peloponnesians' (Τῆς μὲν γνώμης . . . αἰὲ τῆς αὐτῆς ἔχομαι, κτλ.).

This unwavering purpose is then contrasted with the vacillation of others, and both notes are struck again in the closing speech (ii. 61):

'I am the same, and I have not moved: but you have altered, because you

could be convinced when no harm had touched you, but you change your minds when you have to suffer.' (*καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν ὁ αὐτός εἰμι κτλ.*)

So we have Cleon's sharp attack in the very front of his speech on the democracy's change of mind in the matter of Mytilene, set in contrast to his own steadfastness (iii. 37 init.); and in iii. 38 init. the Periclean phrase:—

'I am still of the same opinion as I was, and I am amazed at the proposal to reopen the discussion.' (*Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ὁ αὐτός εἰμι τῇ γνώμῃ κτλ.*)

And why is Athens not to draw back from war and suffering in the one case, from massacre in the other? Because the empire is in danger, and its wealth is the source of strength. (Pericles: *τὰ τῶν ξυμμάχων, ὅθεν ἰσχύομεν.* i. 143. 6. Cleon: *τῆς προσόδου δι' ἣν ἰσχύομεν.* iii. 39. 8.)

And the bonds of that empire are 'force and fear' (Mr. Cornford, p. 114); not for Pericles, it may well be, the only bonds, as they are for Cleon, but still for him, as for Cleon, indispensable. 'Your empire is a tyranny,' he tells the Athenians in so many words, and Cleon echoes the phrase to the letter. (Pericles: *ὡς τυραννίδα γὰρ ἡδὴ ἔχετε αὐτήν, i.e. τὴν ἀρχήν.* ii. 63. Cleon: *τυραννίδα ἔχετε τὴν ἀρχήν.* iii. 37. 2.) The repetition is noticed by Mr. Cornford. 'You have become hated in your empire' (Pericles ii. 63. 1). 'You hold an empire over unwilling subjects' (Cleon iii. 37. 2). Pericles accepts the hatred, one might almost say with complacency, as the lot of all who have ever claimed empire (*ὅσοι ἕτεροι ἐτέρων ἡξίωσαν ἀρχειν* ii. 64. 5.) Cleon complains that the democracy shows its incapacity for that very thing (*ἐτέρων ἀρχειν*) by the mere attempt to rule through a union of hearts (iii. 37). It is utterly foolish, he adds, the hope of extending to others the mutual confidence and security of the daily life at Athens; and surely we ought to recall here the Periclean pride in that same daily trust and freedom. (Pericles: *ἐλευθέρως . . . ἐς τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὑποψίαν* κτλ. ii. 37. 2. Cleon: *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀδεῖς καὶ ἀνεπιβούλευτον πρὸς ἀλλήλους.* iii. 37. 2.)

Once more Cleon scoffs at the trifling sentimental pleasure of yielding to 'rhetorical' appeals for pity compared with the great and solid benefits of power (iii. 40. 2 and 3: *ἐν ᾧ ἡ μὲν πόλις βραχεία ἡσθεῖσα μεγάλη ζημιώσεται*). Pericles lays it down that he is wise 'who chooses envy as the price of greatness' (*ἐπὶ μεγίστοις τὸ ἐπιφθονον λαμβάνει* ii. 64. 6, 7). 'For the hatred does not last long, while the splendour of the present and the glory of the future will remain in the minds of men for ever.' So Plutarch tells us of his offer to bear the expense of decorating the Acropolis on condition that the monuments were inscribed as his. (*Per.* c. 14).

Finally we have from Cleon and Pericles alike, clear, merciless, and bold, the acceptance of an iniquitous basis for their rule with all its consequences.

'The empire may be thought unjust (Pericles ii. 63. 2). The armchair moralist (ii. 64) may blame it, the timid may want to sit at home in quiet and play the honest man, but Athens has gone too far on the path of hatred and of glory to turn back without risk.' What is the cynicism of Cleon but an echo of this?

'Mytilene may have done right to revolt, and the Athenian empire is then unjustifiable; but if the Athenians claim to keep it, right or wrong, as claim they will, then they must go through with the means, just or unjust: otherwise let them give it all up and play the honest man in safety' (iii. 40. 4). *Mutatis mutandis*, this might be a paraphrase of Pericles down to the bitter sneer at ἀνδραγαθίζεσθαι, so pitiful on Pericles' lips after the noble place it took in the speech on the fallen citizens (ii. 42. 4).

The ideal of that speech, it is most true, has nothing corresponding to it in Cleon. Pericles has not only a caution and a sobriety utterly unknown to his successor (and to which Thucydides gives full weight, ii. 65); he has also a standard of life for his own city which does much to redeem its narrowness. To the last he is a noble figure: Cleon, at the best, but a vigorous one. He has not succeeded to the Periclean policy in its fulness; he has only the lust of empire for empire's sake. Yet the selfishness which is the evil seed of lust was already present in Pericles and Periclean Athens, and Thucydides saw it there, just as Aeschylus saw it in the glory of other conquerors and kings (*Ag.* 374 foll., 460 foll., 750 foll.). Of the three figures that dominate the three stages of his history (one might almost say his trilogy)—Pericles, Cleon, and Alcibiades—the first presents the moment when the great house, as yet unshaken, is full of the peril that comes from pride and domination. Thucydides saw this, and what he saw he would not pretend to overlook. So he condemns Pericles, and out of his own mouth, but yet as a great soul condemns, giving full credit to all nobility, yet in no way sparing guilt; nothing extenuating, yet setting down naught in malice; silent, generous, and stern; as Velasquez condemns Pope Innocent and Michael Angelo condemns the Medici.

F. MELIAN STAWELL.

Th
which h
his *dian*
script a
book of
for his
which
Hephae
Graecor
they co
Greek, a
who ha
success.
have b
42-54.

The
employe
lished in
Par. gr.
latter of
the mor
written,
which th
Mr Eng
deficit',
preface
book; b
ever, by
the obsc
clusion
Mr Krol
and 128.

DOROTHEVS OF SIDON.

THE 86 verses of Dorotheus printed at the end of Koechly's *Manetho*, 33 of which had already been published by Salmasius in his *exercitationes Plinianae* or his *diatribae de annis climactericis*, were edited by Iriarte from a scrap of manuscript at Madrid, into which they had been copied, as we now know, from the first book of the astrological treatise of Hephaestion of Thebes, who took Dorotheus for his chief authority. To these 86 verses nearly 300 more, by far the most of which are preserved in the second and third books, still unpublished, of Hephaestion's work, have now been added, in the *catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum* vol. vi (1903) pp. 67 and 91-113, by Mr W. Kroll, the best editor they could have found; a scholar who combines critical talent, knowledge of Greek, and knowledge of astrology, more happily than any of his associates, and who has emended much of the very corrupt text with conspicuous ability and success. A good many additional corrections, chiefly grammatical and metrical, have been made by Mr Ludwig in the *Rheinisches Museum* for 1904, pp. 42-54.

The text of Hephaestion depends at present upon two Parisian MSS employed by Mr A. Engelbrecht in the edition of the first book which he published in 1887 and by Mr Kroll in his collection of the fragments of Dorotheus: Par. gr. 2417 (P) of the 14th century and Par. gr. 2841 (A) of the 13th, from the latter of which the Madrid MS appears to have been copied. Of these two, P is the more complete but also the more corrupt: A, which is less negligently written, omits large portions of the text. What those portions are, is a question which the reader naturally and immediately asks, but which neither Mr Kroll nor Mr Engelbrecht answers. Mr Kroll says on p. 91 'in libri tertii capite quinto deficit', and you infer that it contains i 1-iii 5: Mr Engelbrecht on p. 8 of his preface reveals that this is not so, and that it omits the greater part of the second book; but at what chapter of that book it breaks off he does not reveal. However, by combining the inadequate information of Mr Engelbrecht's preface with the obscure indications of Mr Kroll's apparatus criticus, I have come to the conclusion (which may be wrong) that A contains those verses of Dorotheus which Mr Kroll numbers 1-90 and 121-127, and omits those which he numbers 91-120 and 128-358. Mr Kroll again conceals the fact, which Mr Engelbrecht divulges,

that P too omits a portion of the text, comprising Heph. i 3-19 and therefore comprising those verses of Dorotheus which Mr Kroll numbers 63-86. The following table gives, so far as I can ascertain it, the MS authority on which the text of the citations from Dorotheus reposes; and it may enable a reader to determine, what he will never find out from Mr Kroll's apparatus, whether Mr Kroll's text, when it differs from the lection of the one MS recorded in his note, presents the lection of the other MS, or is merely conjectural:

1-62 AP. 63-86 A. 87-90 AP. 91-120 P. 121-127 AP. 128-358 P.

Apart from these defects Mr Kroll's apparatus criticus has several smaller inaccuracies, whether its dissensions from Engelbrecht deserve that name or no.¹ p. 91 l. 4, text *ἐπὶν*... *εὐρη*, note *ἐπελ*... *εὐροι* codd.: from *cat. cod. astr. Graec.* iv p. 105 and *Rhein. Mus.* 1900 p. 332 we learn that both *ἐπὶν* and *εὐρη* are in most of the MSS. p. 91 footnote 'A (Paris. 2841)... et P (Paris. gr. 2417)', as if P belonged to the Greek series and A did not. p. 92 u. 13, text *δέ <θ> ξξ*, no note: the addition is Ludwich's. p. 92 u. 15, text *ἔλαχεν Κρόνος*, no note; though Engelbrecht records that A has *ἔλαχε*, which may well be right. p. 92 u. 20, note '*μετ'* Ludwich': the emendation is not Ludwich's but Kœchly's. p. 92 u. 21, text *πυράτας δύο δ' ἔλλαχε Φαίνων*, no note: Engelbrecht says that AP omit *δ*. p. 92 u. 24, note '*24 λαχαινα* P': according to Engelbrecht it is in u. 25 that P has this lection. p. 92 u. 33, text *ἐπὶ τὰ δὲ τὰς*, no note: according to Engelbrecht *δὲ* is omitted by the MSS and was added by Iriarte. p. 93, '37 μοίρας om. A ut uid.': 37 should be 39, as a reference to Engelbrecht will show. p. 94 u. 66, text *καὶ*, no note: Engelbrecht and Kœchly record that the MSS have *τε καὶ*. p. 95 u. 76, text '*Τδροχοῆι*, note '*ὑδρηχώω* A': nothing to say that '*Τδροχοῆι* is a conjecture of Ludwich's. p. 96 l. 5, text *κὰν* (which is ungrammatical), no note: Engelbrecht p. 38 prints *καὶ* and mentions no variant. p. 107 footnote: 'cod. 3' should be 'cod. 1'. p. 108 l. 26, text *βεβαῶς*, note '*26 βεβαῶς* P': probably 26 should be 27, where we have *βεβῶς*.

The spelling and accentuation of his text are also rather careless. Some errors have been corrected explicitly or tacitly by Mr Ludwich,—u. 45 *ἡ δὲ* (for *ἡδὲ*), 158 *εἰ γέ μεν*, 212 *γέ μεν*, 220 and 221 *ὅτε* (for *ὅτῃ*), 236 *δὲ ἐ*, 280 *φάεσσι* (for *φάεσσι*),—but others remain: 32 *δὲ ὑπολειπομένης*, 50 *τῇ δ' ὑπο* (but 48 and 62 *τῇ δ' ὑπὸ*), 74 *ἡματίη*, 94 *δὲ ἐν*, 142 *φαυλοῖσι*, 192 *εὔτε*, 243 *ὑπέρθ'*, 302 *ζωοῖς* (for *ζώοις*), 317 *δὲ ὅμοια*, 341 *κίχῃσι*. No such veneration is due to our late and corrupt MSS as would justify the retention of the forms *μοιράσατο* (already corrected by Kœchly) in u. 72 or *φίλῃς* (gen. sing.) in u. 192. In u. 30 Mr Kroll prints *τρίτατος Στῆλβων μετὰ τούσδε | τέσσαρας Ἑρμείας ἔλαχεν* where Kœchly rightly has the adjective *στῆλβων*, and on the other hand in u. 145 he prints *Παφίην ὁπότεν βροτολογίῳς ἔδῃσι | ἡ Φαίνων κρούεις* where the sense requires the name

¹ I omit those places where Mr Kroll plainly contradicts Mr Engelbrecht's statements about P: for he tells us that he has himself collated this MS,

and therefore when at p. 93 u. 43 he says '*θεταρος* P' I assume that he is deliberately correcting the '*θεταρον* P' of Mr Engelbrecht.

Bpor
the to

The l
grauis
about
τετρά
τετρά
I
which
compl
his pr
δρια o
χῶραι
order
far ag
not re
placed
reckon
instea

T
but ev
introd
and tra
simply
spared
howeve

and δλ
postpon
προτίρ
distribu
Σκορπί
constru
Maxim
NO. V

Βροτολοιγός. Here I will turn aside for a moment to correct a similar mistake in the texts of Manetho iii 277–80:

Ἀφρογενεὶ δὲ συνὼν Φαίνων ἡδ' ἀντιπέρηθεν
 πρεσβυτέρας στείρας τ' ἀλόχους καὶ ἀεικέας αἰνῶς
 δῶκεν. καὶ τετράγωνος αἰὲ χαλεπὸς κυθερείη 279
 δεινοὺς γὰρ τε γάμους καὶ εὐφροσύνης ἄτερ ἔρδει.

The Latin version in the Firmin-Didot edition renders u. 279 'et quadratus semper grauis est ueneri': Manetho however is not talking about *uenus* or *κυθήρεια* but about *coniubium* or *γάμος*. *κυθερείη* should be *Κυθερείη*, and the dative depends on *τετράγωνος*, 'quadratus Veneri': so vi 278 ἀλλήλαις . . . τετράγωνοι, i 341 Ἡελίῳ τετράγωνος Ἄρης.

Is it a rule of etiquette, or pure vanity, or irrepressible originality of genius, which ordains that each successive editor of a collection of fragments shall complicate our studies by changing the sequence and numeration established by his predecessor? The first 62 verses of Dorotheus deal with the *χῶραι* and the *δρια* of the twelve zodiacal signs, and in Koechly's edition the 21 verses about the *χῶραι* were placed before the 41 verses about the *δρια*; which was not indeed the order observed by Hephaestion, who quotes *χῶραι* and *δρια* alternately, but yet so far agreed with it that the *χῶραι* came first and the *δρια* second. Mr Kroll has not recurred to Hephaestion's arrangement, but he has inverted Koechly's, and has placed the *δρια* before the *χῶραι*; so that all the first 62 lines have now a double reckoning, and whenever I refer to any of these verses I must use two numbers instead of one.

5 Kroll (=26 Koechly).

ὁκτὼ δ' ἔλαχε πρώτας ὀρίων μοίρας Κυθήρεια.

To repair the metre of this verse Mr Ludwich formerly proposed *ὁκτὼ ἔχει*; but every one of these twelve excerpts touching the *δρια* of the constellations is introduced by the conjunction *δέ*. He now, *Rhein. Mus.* 1904 p. 43, ejects *ὀρίων* and transposes *ἔλαχε*: *ὁκτὼ δὲ πρώτας ἔλαχεν μοίρας Κυθήρεια*. But it suffices simply to strike *ἔλαχε* out. Perhaps the reader thinks that the verb cannot be spared: the scribe thought so too, and that is why he inserted it. The sentence however is completed as follows,

ὁκτὼ δὲ πρώτας ὀρίων μοίρας Κυθήρεια
 ἐν τούτῳ, Στίλβων δὲ μετ' αὐτὴν ἔλλαχε μοίρας
 δις τρεῖς,

and *ἔλλαχε* is to be supplied from the second clause. Just as Dorotheus here postpones the verb, so in 36 (=57) sq. does he postpone the object: *ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς προτέρας Ἑρμῆς λάχεν, εἴτα μετ' αὐτὸν | ἔξ μοίρας Κύπρις*; and there is a similar distribution of words in 76 sq. *μᾶλλον Κρόνος Τδροχοσίη, | Ζεὺς δ' ἐνὶ Τοξεντῇ, καὶ Σκορπίῳ ἥδεται Ἄρης* and 98 *Σκορπίου εἰσαφίκηται ἡ ἐξ δέμας Ἀρνειοῖο*. The construction *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* often gives editors more trouble than it ought: thus in Maximus 127, *εἰ δὲ τε δεύτερον ἡμαρ ἢ ἐς τρίτον ἰθύσειεν*, Mr Ludwich alters *εἰ δὲ*

τε το εἰ δ' ἔς and all the other editors alter ἡ ἔς to ἡέ; yet the MS text is quite right and means ἔς δεύτερον ἢ τρίτον ἡμαρ.

28 (=49).

πέντε Ζεὺς φαέθων, πυμάτας δ' ἔξ ἔλλαχε Φαίνων.

It is the only dark blot on Dorotheus' fair fame as a metrist that he habitually allows a short final vowel to remain short before an initial ζ; not, like Homer, in words which must enjoy this licence if they are to be used at all, Ζάκυνθος and Ζέλεια, but, like Opp. *cyn.* i 92 μεσσόθι ζώνης and Maneth. i 16 Ἑρμεία Ζῆνα, in words which can easily be brought into the verse without it, Ζεὺς, Ζυγός, and ζῶν. Three examples are presented by his MSS, 24 (45) ἐπτά δὲ Ζεὺς φαέθων, 185 ἐν τινι ζῶφ, 246 ἀμφὶ Ζυγῷ δέ, and five more have been added by emendations which are practically certain, 70 ἐν Διδύμοισι Ζυγῷ τε, 82 εἰκοστῇ δὲ μιῇ τε Ζυγοῦ, 189 ἀκουόντων ἐπὶ ζῶων, 259 εἰ δ' ἐνὶ ζῶφ, 304 εἰν ἐνὶ ζῶφ. Mr Ludwig does not believe that the author of these verses would have allowed the ε of πέντε in 28 (49) to be lengthened ἐν ἄρσει, in the second half of the foot, before the ζ of Ζεὺς; and he proposes to write πέντε <δὲ> Ζεὺς as in 24 (45).

The change is easy, for δέ has again disappeared from the MSS and was restored by Iriarte in 33 (54) ἐπτά <δὲ> τὰς πρώτας; but I do not admit that it is necessary or even probable, and surely it is rather wanting in charity. When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, it seems hard that he should have no better welcome than ἀλλὰ μοι ἔρρε δόμοιο καὶ εἰς Ἑλένην ἀφίκανε. Let us reason from analogy. Dorotheus, like Homer himself, often lets a short final vowel remain short before an initial mute followed by ρ; not only in words which render the licence necessary, τρίγωνος, τριγωνίζων, προσώποις (261, 305, 357, p. 91 ll. 18, 19), but in 84 ἐννέα τρισσάκι, p. 91 l. 3 σχήμασι τριπλεύροις, u. 38 (59) πυμάτας δὲ Κρόνος (65, 269, 315, 357), 316 ἔκ τε χρόνιοιο, 326 εὔτε δὲ βρυχητῆρος, 170 πλησιφέεσσα δρόμον. Yet this does not prevent him from lengthening a short vowel before χρ in 124,

καὶ λάθρῃ πρήσσοντι καὶ ὅσσα χρῆζε σιωπῆς,

even ἐν ἄρσει and even at the bucolic diaeresis. Again, Maximus ends u. 342 of his περὶ καταρχῶν with ἀλσεῖ δμῶα, which is hardly less reprehensible than the ἐν τινι ζῶφ of Dorotheus; yet he mends his ways and begins u. 434 with καὶ τε δμῶς προφύγησιν, and Mr Ludwig does not send him back to his sins. The truth seems to be that Dorotheus, in this long and dull enumeration of the δρια, has caught at every change of phrase which occurred to him; and I willingly trust the MSS when they offer these three variations: 24 (45) ἐπτά δὲ Ζεὺς φαέθων, 28 (49) πέντε Ζεὺς φαέθων, 34 (55) ἐπτά δέ τοι Φαέθων.

48 (=7).

τῷ δ' ὑπὸ Θρηκίων καὶ Αἰθιόπων κλίμα κείται.

Examples of καὶ thus left unshortened ἐν ἄρσει when a vowel follows are pretty common in Mr Kroll's text of Dorotheus, and also in Mr Olivieri's text of

the fragments of Antiochus of Athens, *C.C.A.G.* i pp. 108-113. The examples in Antiochus are the following.

p. 109 l. 2 ζώης σῆμα δύνει καὶ ἄγρια πῆματ' ἔδωκεν.

An hexameter which has a cretic for its second foot may well have a trochee for its third; here however it is not the MS that gives bad metre, but the editor. These are the native wood-notes wild of Mr Olivieri: instead of ζώης σῆμα δύνει (which by the way is pure nonsense) the MS has ζωήσημα δύνει, whence there instantly emerges

καὶ χρόνον ὥκυν

ζωήης ἡμάλδυνε καὶ ἄγρια πῆματ' ἔδωκεν.

Next comes

p. 112 l. 1 εὐδήλους τοκέας καὶ εὐπρεπείας φιλίου τε.

Here the remedy is obvious, τοκέας καὶ εὐπρεπείας. There remains

p. 112 l. 9 ἢν δ' Ἄρης νεύσῃ καὶ ἐς δρόμον ὥκυν ἐλαύνῃ,

where the irregularity of metre and the inequality of tense would both be removed by writing νεύσει: the form δώσει occurs p. 112 l. 4 in the same position, πλοῦτον ὑπερδώσει καὶ ἐκ χθονὸς εὐρυχόριοι.

And now for Dorotheus. Apart from καί, he allows a long final vowel or diphthong to remain long ἐν ἄρσει before an initial vowel only where Homer allows it, at the bucolic diacresis: 56 (15) αὐτῷ ἔπλετο πᾶσα, 173 ἐλαφρῇ ἔσσεται ὦνή; for in 99 Ἄρεως ἡ ἀστέρος (ἡ'), as in 209 καὶ οἱ ('Foi) and 273 καὶ ἐλπίδες (ἐλπίδες), there is properly speaking no hiatus, and the scansion is strictly Homeric. But in the case of καί Mr Kroll's text exhibits five violations of the rule, u. 48 (7 already quoted and the following four:

66 Ταύρου Παρθενικῆς καὶ Αἰγόκερω κρατέουσιν.

208 δία Σεληναίῃ καὶ Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς εὐῖσα.

322 ὕστερον αὖ φυλακὴν καὶ ἀλγέα φεύζεται αὐτός.

336 αὐτὰρ ἐν Τδροχόφ καὶ Ἰχθύσι δὴν μένουσι.

This same Dorotheus, be it remembered, has nearly 40 places where καί in similar circumstances is shortened, and he writes 262 ἡὲ καὶ ἀντικρυς (not ἡ), 310 ἐτέρωιο καὶ εἰς ὁδόν (not ἐτέρου), 356 δεσμοῖο καὶ ἦν (not δεσμοῦ), p. 67 l. 11 τοῖσι καὶ αἰθέρος (not τοῖς).

One of the exceptions, u. 66, is not merely bad metre but nonsense. There is no such sign in the zodiac as the Bull's Virgin or the Virgin's Bull; and if this sign existed, and Capricorn were added to it, the sum would be two, not three, which is the sum required. The second Trigon, of which Dorotheus is here speaking, consists of Taurus, Virgo, and Capricorn,

Ταύρου Παρθενικῆς τε καὶ Αἰγόκερω,

and to restore the sense restores the metre. And from Engelbrecht and Koechly we learn that this is the reading of the MSS.

Next I will take u. 322, for here again Mr Kroll has deserted the tradition.

The MS, instead of ὕστερον αὖ φυλακὴν, has ὕστερον δ' αὖ φυλακτηκὴν, and φυλακτηκὴν might just as easily be altered to φυλακὴν τε. But there is more than metre to think about, for the whole sentence runs thus,

ἐν Ταύρῳ μενέει δὲ πολλὸν χρόνον· εἵνεκα δ' αὖτε
κτῆσιος ἦν ἄρα τοῦτο πάθος, ταύτην μὲν ὀλέσσει,
ὕστερον δ' αὖ φυλακτηκὴν καὶ ἄλγεα φεύζεται αὐτός· 322

and the sense and the preceding μέν require the δέ which Mr Kroll, seeking metre yet not obtaining it, has banished from the text. The prisoner, if the Moon is in Taurus at the time of his imprisonment, will lie long in durance and will forfeit any property which may have been the cause of his incarceration; but he himself in the end will escape safe and sound. Now in the first of these lines the MS has δὲ μενέει δέ, corrected by Mr Kroll: the scribe, not content to wait for the coming δέ, inserted it before its time. Similarly in 322 I believe that Dorotheus wrote

ὕστερον αὖ φυλακὴν δὲ καὶ ἄλγεα φεύζεται αὐτός,

and that the copyist transferred the conjunction to its usual place. δέ is postponed till the middle of the verse is reached not only in 320 but in 183 τετρατὴν πλευρῇ δέ (so Manetho ii 425, iii 409, vi 528, iv 77; and τε in 55 (14) Ἰταλὴν χώρην τε, 58 (17) Ἀμμωνος Λιβύην τε.

At u. 208 I will also quote the context:

λώϊον Ἵδρωχόφ καὶ Σκορπίφ καὶ Λέοντι
διὰ Σεληναίη καὶ Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐούσα. 208

Mr Kroll does not tolerate the metre of 207 but writes ἡδὲ Λέοντι: the exchange of synonyms is a common form of error. I make the same correction in 208,

διὰ Σεληναίη ἡδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐούσα.

The legitimate hiatus at the caesura recurs in 27 (48), 51 (10), 143, 167: what should induce Dorotheus to prefer a scansion which was illegitimate?

The verse from which I started, 48 (7), may be amended in the same way,

τῷ δ' ὑπὸ Θρηκίων ἡδ' Αἰθίοπων κλίμα κείται·

though the τε καὶ of Koehly (and seemingly also of the cod. Matr.), ignored by Messrs Kroll and Engelbrecht, may just as well be right. And finally in u. 336 the parallel of Manetho v 155 Ἵδρωχόφ ἡδ' Ἰχθύσι (if that is the true reading) suggests that we should write

αὐτὰρ ἐν Ἵδρωχόφ ἡδ' Ἰχθύσι δὴν μενέουσι.

Here however there is yet another possibility. In 76 ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοι τούτων μάλλον Κρόνος Ἵδρωχοῖ the MSS, instead of the last word, give ὕδρηχώφ and ὕδροχώφ; and in 336 the metre may again be corrected by restoring the longer form,

αὐτὰρ ἐν Ἵδρωχοῖ καὶ Ἰχθύσι δὴν μενέουσι.

110.

**Ἀρης δ' εὐτέ κεν <ῆ> καθυπέρτερος Ἑρμείας.*

This is Mr Kroll's text, and his note is 'κεν ῆ] καὶ P'; and I wonder what it means. Is *κεν* a conjecture or a MS reading? It is not in A, for A, though Mr Kroll never says so, omits this portion of Hephaestion. But I notice in C.C.A.C. i p. 9 that a Florentine MS, Laur. xxviii 13, contains a transcript or paraphrase of this chapter ii 22, and Mr Kroll, for aught I know, may here be using it: the same taciturnity which conceals the absence of A would conceal the presence of Laur. xxviii 13.

Be that as it may, I demur to the addition of *ῆ*, for Dorotheus, who has *συνέωσι* at 284, nowhere employs any form of the verb *εἰμί* which Homer does not employ, and the contraction cannot safely be ascribed to him by conjecture. If *κεν* is the reading of the Florentine MS, then I should write *εὐτέ κ' ῆ*; but if *καὶ* is the sole tradition, then *εὐτε κίη* or *κίοι* would be equally probable: see 182 *θεῆς συνοδόνδε κιοῦσης* and 305 *ἐρχόμενοι*.

The next sentences of Hephaestion's prose require correction as follows. *ἀκούει δὲ ἀλλήλων τὰ ἴσον ἀπέχοντα τῶν ἰσημερινῶν ζῳδίων, οἷον Ταῦρος (Σκορπίος P) καὶ Ἰχθύες, Δίδυμοι καὶ Τδροχός, καὶ ἐφεξῆς τὰ ἄλλα ζῳδία. Κριὸς δὲ καὶ Ζυγὸς, φησὶν ἀκολουθῶν Θρασύλλω, οὐκ ἀκούει ἀλλήλων. βλέποντα δὲ ζῳδία τὰ ἴσον ἀπέχοντα τῶν τροπικῶν ζῳδίων. Κριὸς δὲ ἐπιτάττει τῷ Ζυγῷ διὰ τὸ ἐν μὲν Κριῷ αὖξιν τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν δὲ Ζυγῷ μειοῦν. ὁμοίως καὶ Καρκίνος (Σκορπίω καὶ P) Αἰγόκερῳ ἐπιτάττει, τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα. 'Iam brachia contrahit ardens Scorpius et caeli iusta plus parte relinquit'. That sign must have been in the ascendant when the scribe was copying this paragraph, for a few lines lower down it has even usurped the place of the preposition *ἀπό*.*

111.

Φαίνων καὶ Πυρόεις νυκτὸς ῆματι δ' Ἀρης.

'lacuna sex litterarum in P.' These six letters can be recovered without any uncertainty: *Ἀρης* is another name for *Πυρόεις*, and the lost word was another name for *Φαίνων*.

Φαίνων καὶ Πυρόεις, νυκτὸς <Κρόνος>, ῆματι δ' Ἀρης.

112-116.

*ἄλλοι δ' ἐκ Μήνης εἰς ὄγδοον ὠρονόμοιο
ζῶν ἀριθμήσαντες ἀπὸ Κρόνου αὐθις ἔδωκαν.*

*εἰς ὃν δὴ λήξειε τόπον καὶ ἀνακτα τόποι,
σκέπτονται τούτων ἐπιμάρτυρες οὔτινές εἰσι
τῶν ἀπο δὴ φράσσαντο τέλος αἰσχροῦ τε καὶ ἐσθλόν.*

114

A conjunction is wanted in 114, *εἰς ὃν δὲ λήξειε τόπον*. For the metre see 178 *καὶ πρήγμα λῶν καταθήσει, 236 Ταῦρ δὲ μέγα χεῖμα*. And *δέ*, though Mr Kroll

forgets to record it, is actually the reading of a Venetian MS, Marc. 334, which preserves verses 112 and 114 in a chapter printed in *C.C.A.G.* ii p. 159.

135-137.

ἄνδρα μὲν Ἡέλιον καὶ ἀνερχόμενον σκοπὸν ὄρης,
αὐτὴν δ' ἐκ ζῴου θ' ἡμερόφρονα δυομένοιο
κούρην ἂν φράσσαιο καὶ ἡυκόμου Κυθερείης.

Mr Kroll, who believes the MSS when they impute to Dorotheus the scansion Ζῳγῷ and Ζῳγοῦ, and even proposes to thrust upon him by conjecture the hiatus τῇ δ' ἴσα Ἑρμείας, here prints ἡμερόφρονα in u. 136 and says 'uocalem longam pro breui usurpatam poeta haud indignam putauit'. Mr Ludwig, remarking that he does not know what ἡμερόφρονα κούρην would mean, himself proposes ἱερόφρονα, which is downright comical. Meanwhile the altogether superfluous θ' is reverentially preserved. Dorotheus wrote *θεμερόφρονα*: Hesych. *θεμερόφρονας* συνετοῦς, σῶφρονας.

142.

Ἡέλιος φαύλοισι βεβλαμμένος Ἀφρογενής τε.

If once we turn our eyes away from his pertinacious misconception of the properties of initial ζ' (which after all is not more heinous in itself than Hesiod's *πετραίη τε σκυῖ*), Dorotheus is a good metrist and strict in his observance of position: stricter than Homer, incomparably stricter than the rest of the astrologers. Even at the contact of two words he never neglects it unless the second letter is ρ, and only twice does he allow the first letter to be a medial 170 *πλησιφέεσσα δρόμον*, 326 *εὔτε δὲ βρυχητήρος*. Within the body of a word he disregards it only in a single instance, and the exception proves the rule: it is the astrological term *τετράγωνος* (181, 196, 261), which cannot without this licence be brought into hexameter verse. True, at 190 there is one example of *ἀριθμός* against six (96, 97, 113, 129, 170, 210) of *ἀριθμός* and *ἀριθμῆσαι*; but the passage is unintelligible and corrupt, and the context rather suggests *ἀρθμός*. The *τετράπλευρον* of 175, as we shall soon see, is merely a conjecture.

Maximus and the genuine Manetho of books ii iii vi are much less scrupulous than Dorotheus, and neglect internal position in such words as *πότμον*, *λυγρῇ*, *γενέσθαι*, *ἀθρήσαι*, *κύκλος*, *ἄχρι*, *κύπριν*, *δίφρω*, *τέκνα*. But even they, in grafting Attic scansion on epic verse, do not transgress all limits; and though Maximus disregards initial γλ and δμ in 11 *ἐν γλῆνεσιν* and 342 *ἄλσει δμῶα*, and Manetho initial βλ in ii 418 *παντοίαις τε βλαβαῖς* (which the editors print as *βλάβαις*), they never make light of βλ or any such weighty combination of letters within the body of a word. When we reach the so-called 4th book of Manetho, then indeed we enter another world, where not only *ἀκτινᾶ βλέπη* but also *θρασύγλωσσέας* and *διᾶβλήτορας* and *ἐβλασταν* and *μετάβλήμασι* and *ὑπὲρβλητα* may be encountered; but this is a world even further removed from Dorotheus than from the Manetho of the genuine books.

And the author of this verse 142 is also the author of 324,

ἡμασι τοῖς πρώτοις τετράσεται ἐν κακότητι.

He might have written *πρώτοις τετράσεται* with no fear of censure, but he would not. Yet Mr Kroll, without any protest from Mr Ludwich, supposes that he wrote *φαύλοισι βεβλαμμένος*; wrote it in a verse where he was so mindful of his principles that he did not give the planet Venus her proper name and say ἡδ' 'Αφροδίτη, but called her 'Αφρογενής instead.

And now, what of the MSS? A is absent, P has *φαῦλος*, and *φαύλοισι*, unless Mr Kroll has surreptitiously imported it from Laur. xxviii 13, is his own conjecture. Write *φαύλοισι βεβλαμμένος*.

150, 151.

ἐσθλοὶ δ' αὖ μβίοις ὠκύν γόνον εἰσορόωντες
παίδων τέκμαρ ἔχουσιν ἐτήτυμον.

Mr Kroll proposes *ἐσθλοὶ δ' ἀμφοῖν*¹; Mr Ludwich makes a groundless objection to the lengthening of the final syllable and conjectures *αὐξιβίοις* or *αὐξιβίοι τ'*. What meaning they assign to *ὠκύν γόνον* I cannot tell.

Cobet *nou. lect.* p. 281, in disparagement of a remark of Elmsley's at Eur *Heracl.* 38, that δ and ρ are sometimes confused, has these sentences: 'non est ea utilis obseruatio, quoniam ii errores non orti sunt ex similitudine formae oculis scribarum fallente, sed ex mera oscitantia eorum, qui alii agentes quiduis pro quouis describebant. fieri potest ut α in β transierit et in γ et in ε, sed nihil prodest id saepe notare et sunt hae obseruationes steriles'. But the change of α into β, at any rate, is neither difficult nor uncommon: Bast *comm. pal.* p. 707 'si Alpha . . . sic scribitur, ut ductus calami superne interruptus hiet, forma eius ad Beta accedit: . . . itaque non mirum, scribas legisse . . . ἀρβιούσθαι pro ἀραιούσθαι'. In the verse of Antiochus printed *C.C.A.G.* i p. 112 l. 21 we have the converse error, *δλαιον* for *δλβιον*, and here the true reading is

ἐσθλοὶ δ' αὖ M α ἰ η ς ὠκύν γόνον εἰσορόωντες,

'the benefics (Sun Moon Jupiter Venus) when they aspect Mercury', who is not *ἐσθλός* but *ἐπικόινος*. Mercury is *Μαίης κοῦρος* in 69 and *Μαίης πάις* in 340, and *ὠκύν* is one of this planet's stock epithets, *C.C.A.G.* ii p. 82.

156, 157.

τοῦνεκεν ἐν Κριφῷ μὲν ἀναίνεο πάμπαν εὐούσης
νύμφεσιν.

νυμφεύσειν Kroll: it must be either *νυμφεύειν* or *νυμφεύσαι*.

¹ Mr Ludwich says that this ought to be *proparoxytone*: it ought to be *properispomenon*.

158-162.

εἴ γε μὲν ἐμ πόσιός τις ἔχει δάμαρ ἢ δάμαρτος
 ἀνὴρ ἐν ζῳίῳ Μήνην κακοδαιμονέοντι,
 τούτων ἀμφοτέρων κράτος οἴσεται, ὅς κεν ἔχησι
 δωδέκατον μετὰ χώρον ἀφ' ὠρονόμοιο Σελήνην
 εἰν ἐτέρου γενέσει, καὶ δεσπότῃ εἵκελος ἔσται.

Mr Kroll prefixes an obelus to the ἐμ of 158 and Mr Ludwich alters it to ἦ, but it is quite sound. The construction is εἴ τις δάμαρ ἔχει Μήνην ἐμ πόσιος ζῳίῳ κακοδαιμονέοντι ἢ τις ἀνὴρ Μήνην ἐν δάμαρτος ζῳίῳ κακοδαιμονέοντι. If, in the wife's geniture, the Moon is situate in that sign of the zodiac which, in the husband's geniture, occupies the twelfth house (the κακὸς δαίμων), or vice versa, then that one of the pair will be master in whose geniture the Moon is not so situate, but is found in a sign of the zodiac which, in the other party's geniture, comes after the twelfth house. δωδέκατον μετὰ χώρον means in the first house (the ὠροσκόπος itself), or the second, or any other down to the eleventh; for Manetho vi 35 sqq. speaks of the twelfth house in these terms, ἦν δὲ Σεληναίη μὲν ἐφ' ὠρονόμῳ ἐπιτέλλῃ | ἐν προτέρῳ δ' ὥρης ζῳίῳ Φαίνων προθήσειν, | δαίμονα τόν τε κακὸν πρότεροι φῶτες καλέσαντο.

What I have said above will, I hope, enable a reader to understand the similar passage in Manetho vi 216-221, and to correct the blunders of the Latin version in the Firmin-Didot edition:

δαίμονι δ' ἦν χαλεπῷ κείνης Μήνη πέλῃ ἀνδρὶ,
 αἰὲν ἀτασθαλίῃσι γυνὴ ἀθερίζει ἀκοίτην
 οὐδὲν ὀπιζομένη λεχέων θεσμῶν τε γάμοιο.
 ταῦτα δ' ἄρ' ἐκ ποσίων τελέθει δειλῇσι γυναιξίν,
 εὐτε Σεληναίη ἀλόχοις ἐν δαίμονι λυγρῷ
 ἀνδρῶν φαίνεται· δίχα γὰρ νόον αἰὲν ἔχουσιν.

Here δαίμονι χαλεπῷ and λυγρῷ mean the same as ζῳίῳ κακοδαιμονέοντι in Dorotheus.

174-176.

καὶ δὲ Σεληναίης φάσαις λεύσσης κεν ιούσης
 ἐκ συνόδου πρῶτον μετὰ τετράπλευρον
 αἶθοπος 'Ηελίοιο, δικαιοτέροιςιν ἄμεινον.

Mr Kroll amends the φάσαις of 174 to φάσιν αἶ; but we ought not to violate by conjecture the rule which forbids αἶ κεν to be thus separated: besides, αἶ is not found in Dorotheus any more than in Manetho or Maximus, though both Mr Kroll and Mr Ludwich introduce it at 242¹. The metre of 175 Mr Kroll attempts to restore by writing πρῶτον μετα<ιουσομένης> τετράπλευρον; but what he builds up with one hand he breaks down with the other. Dorotheus, as I explained at u. 142, did not scan τετράπλευρον as ~ ~ ~ ~: his scansion is seen in 271 Ζεὺς δ' ὅτε τετράπλευρος

¹ καὶ καθε βλασυροῖ cod., καὶ δ' αἶ κεν ΒΑ. Ludwich: probably καὶ δ' αἶ κεν ΒΑ.

ἀνω χθονὸς οὖσαν ἰδῆται, 92 τριπλεύρου κρατέοντας ἐν ᾧ θεὸς "Ἡλῖός ἐστιν, p. 91 l. 3 σχήμασι τριπλεύροις κακοεργέες ἀμβλύνονται. Moreover, if a second participle is added to *ἰούσης ἐκ συνόδου μετὰ τετράπλευρον*, a conjunction must be added as well. The following gives at any rate the form of the verse and the sentence :

Σεληναίης φάσιν εἰ λεύσσης κεν ἰούσης
ἐκ συνόδου <πρώτην>πρώτον μετὰ τετράπλευρον
αἶθοπος Ἡελίοιο.

179, 180.

ἕως δέ κεν εἰς διάμετρον,
ἐσθλὴ πιπράσκοντι καὶ ἐγκαλέοντι συνοίσει.

The subject of the sentence is the Moon. 'κεν εἰς] possis *κίη* uel *κίχη*' says Mr Kroll ; but there is a much easier way :

ἕως δέ κεν εἰς διάμετρον
ἐλθῇ, πιπράσκοντι καὶ ἐγκαλέοντι συνοίσει.

182.

ἀνείσθαι τότε καλὸν ὃ βούλεται ἢ διακόνῃαι.

Throughout this passage the man to whom the Moon portends profit or loss in his buying and selling is addressed in the second person : 171 ὠνήσει, δώσεις, 174 λεύσσης, 177 δώσεις, 178 καταθήσει, 184 δόιης. βούλεται therefore should be βούλεαι.

185-190.

Heph. iii 20 (πῶς δεῖ ἀρχοντι καὶ δυνάστη συντυχεῖν) . . . εἰ δὲ ἴδῃς καὶ τὰς γενέσεις τούτων οἷς συντυχεῖν θέλεις,

καὶ δ' ὅταν ἐξ ὥρης κεκλωμένον ἔν τινι ζῳφ
κείμενον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔχει δ' ἐν τῷδε Σελήνην
ᾧ τινι συμβαλέεις, μάλα κεν πεφίλησαι αὐτῷ. 185

185 'nil mutare ausus sum nisi ζώοις' Kroll. Mr Ludwich, apparently preoccupied with the solecism *ὅταν ἔχει* and heeding little else, removes it by the following conjecture, *καὶ δ' ὅταν. ἐξεύρη κυκλούμενον ἔν τινι ζῳφ | κείμενος εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔχη δ' ἐν τῷδε* etc., 'was einen erträglichen Sinn giebt' says he. I wish he had explained this sense, for I can discover none, nor even a construction. The subject of *ἐξεύρη* can only be the antecedent of *ᾧ τινι*, the great man with whom you are seeking an interview ; how does this personage perform the feat of lying in a sign of the zodiac for a revolving year ? and where are we to find an object for *ἐξεύρη* ? and with what intent does Mr Ludwich add 'Vgl. S. 91 V. 2 ἀστὴρ δ' οὐκέτι φαῦλος, ἐπὶν ἀγαθὸν τόπον εὔρη' ? This is not the only place where Mr Ludwich's proposals leave me much in doubt whether he comprehends the astrological requirements of the context.

I adopt however his *κυκλούμενον* (see Eur. *Or.* 1645 and *Phoen.* 477 *ἐνιαυτοῦ κύκλον*, *Phoen.* 544 *τὸν ἐνιαύσιον κύκλον*) and I conjecture

καὶ δ' ὅτ' ἀναξ ὥρης κυκλούμενον ἐν τινι ζῳῳ
 κείμενος ἦν ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔχει δ' ἐν τῷδε Σελήνην
 ᾧτινι συμβαλέεις, μάλα κεν πεφίλησαι αὐτῷ.

κείμενος ἦν for *κείμενος εἰς* is no more than a metathesis of the two final letters. The *ἀναξ ὥρης* is the *οἰκοδεσπότης ὠροσκόπον*, called *ἀναξ ὠρονόμου* in 226 sq. and *ὥρης βασιλεύς* in 304 sq.,—the planet who is lord of that house in which the horoscope chances to be. The sense therefore is this: if the lord of the house of your horoscope remained in one sign of the zodiac for a whole year (this might easily happen if the *οἰκοδεσπότης* were Jupiter and usually happens when the *οἰκοδεσπότης* is Saturn), and if, in the geniture of the potentate whose presence you are about to enter, the Moon is found to have been situate in that same sign, then you will gain his favour.

We proceed:

ἦν δ' ἔτος ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμοῦ πῆσθ' εἰς ἓνα χῶρον,
 σύμφωνον τὸ δ' ὅμοιον ἀκούντων ἐπὶ ζῳῳ
 ἦεν ἡ δερκομένην.

190

The first year of a man's life, I must premise, falls under that sign of the zodiac in which his horoscope was situate, the second under the next sign, and so on till the 12 signs are exhausted; the 13th year belongs to the same sign as the first, and the circle revolves anew. If now both you and the great personage to whom you present your petition are passing a year of your life which falls under the same sign, that circumstance is *σύμφωνον*, conducive to harmony. Suppose for example that you were born nearly 26 years ago under the sign of Aries, and he was born nearly 30 years ago under the sign of Sagittarius, then the current year of both your lives falls under the sign of Taurus, and your petition is likely to succeed. τὸ δ' ὅμοιον, the case is similar, ἐπ' ἀκούντων ἡ δερκομένην ζῳῳ; that is, if the year of his life and the year of yours, instead of falling under one sign, fall under two signs which hear one another (i.e. are equidistant from the equinoctial signs), such as Taurus and Pisces, or which see one another (i.e. are equidistant from the tropical signs), such as Taurus and Virgo.

Mr Kroll corrects the metre of 190 by writing *ἦν* for *ἦεν*; but the tense is wrong and no verb is needed. I write *ἡ ἐν δερκομένην*, comparing 294 sq. *παρέστων | ἡ ἐν λευσσούτων*.

205-210.

Heph. iii 28 *φυλάττου δὲ δανείζων τὴν τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ μετὰ Κρόνου στάσιν καὶ ἐτι τῆς Σελήνης ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ Λέοντος καὶ τῶν Διδύμων καὶ τοῦ Τοξότου, καὶ ὅτε τούτων αἱ ἀρχαὶ τῶν ζῳδίων*

I do
 three wo
 and the
 179 as
Λέοντι
 sense; a
τροπικῶ
'Αφρογ
 these in
 can be t
ἐν τοῖς
 Str

The δὲ
ἐθελει
 178), b
 Then i
 in 236.

V
 omitt
 (ὠρονό
 so doe
 that M

γαίης ὑπερ ἀντέλλουσιν.¹

205

εἰ δὲ λαβεῖν ἐθέλεις αὐτὸς χρέος, ὧδέ τοι ἔστω
 λώϊον· Ἐδροχόφ καὶ Σκορπίφ ἡδὲ Λέοντι
 δια Σεληναίῃ ἡδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐοῦσα
 ἡ ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ καὶ οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω,
 ὥς δ' αὐτὼς καὶ ἀριθμός.

210

I do not understand. What can be the meaning of ὧδέ τοι ἔστω λώϊον? The three words ὧδέ τοι ἔστω, 'let the celestial position be as follows,' might be sense; and the prose paraphrase quoted by Mr Kroll from cod. Vind. phil. gr. 108 (not 179 as he says), ἐὰν δανείσασθαι θέλῃς, ἔστω ἡ Σελήνη Ἐδροχόφ ἡ Σκορπίφ ἡ Λέοντι ἡ Ἰχθύσιν ἡ Τοξότη λευσιφωτοῦσα καὶ τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς ἀφαιρούσα, is also sense; and so are 129 sq. προσθετικὴ φάεσιν . . . ἔστω τοι Κερέσσο, 151 sq. ἐν τροπικῇ δὲ | ζῶφ μηδὲ νυ Κύπρις εἰς τότε μηδὲ Σελήνη, 294 sq. Ζεὺς δὲ καὶ Ἀφρογενὴς ὥρῃ Μήνη τε παρέστων | ἡ ἐν λευσσόντων; but add λώϊον to any of these imperatives or optatives and it will turn them into nonsense. And what can be the grammar of 207-9? Who will construe me the words Σεληναίῃ ἐοῦσα ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ καὶ οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω?

Structure and sense may both be obtained in this way:

εἰ δὲ λαβεῖν ἐθέλεις αὐτὸς χρέος, ὧδέ τοι ἔστω
 λώϊον Ἐδροχόφ καὶ Σκορπίφ ἡδὲ Λέοντι
 δια Σεληναίῃ ἡδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐοῦσα
 ἡ ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ καὶ οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω,
 ὥς δ' αὐτὼς καὶ ἀριθμός.

The ὧδε of 206 now means not 'as follows' but 'in that case,' εἰ δανείσασθαι ἐθέλεις καὶ μὴ δανείσαι. Perhaps λώϊον should be λῶϊον (the form λῶϊον occurs at 178), but I doubt if the change is necessary: the neuter will mean 'a better sign.' Then is added the caution καὶ οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω, like κακὸς δὲ ἐμὴ τις ὁράτω in 236.

211-215.

εἰ δὲ νῦν τις πάτρηθεν ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπὴν χθόνα βαίνοι,
 αὐτὸν ἀφ' ὠρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν, εἰς δὲν ἀπεισιν,
 ἐκ δυτικοῦ κέντρον, πρῆξιν δὲ τοῖς ἐκ μεσάτοιο
 ὕψους εὐ φράσσαιο, τί δ' αὖ τέλος ἔσσεται αὐτῇ
 ζῶφ ὑποχθονίφ σάφα κεν μάλα τεκμήριο.

212

214

Verse 212 must be punctuated as above, or else the two last commas must be omitted: ὠρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν εἰς δὲν ἀπεισιν | ἐκ. Mr Kroll's punctuation (ὠρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν εἰς δὲν ἀπεισιν, | ἐκ) destroys both sense and grammar, and so does Mr Ludwig's (ὠρονόμου χῶρόν γε μὲν, εἰς δὲν ἀπεισιν, | ἐκ). It is probable that Mr Kroll, despite the perversity of his stops, understands the passage; but

¹ So I write: ὑπερ ἀντέλλουσιν cod., ὑπεραντέλλουσι Kroll.

Mr Ludwich, by proposing τί δὴ (τί δὲ cod., τί δ' αὖ Kroll) in 214, makes it plain that he does not. Its meaning is this: if a man takes a journey to a foreign country, consult the horoscope or ascendant about the man himself, the occident about the land whither he is bound, the zenith about the business he has in hand, and the nadir about its final issue. Compare Heph. iii 26 (Doroth. 204) εἰ τις οὖν χρήζων προσενέγκαι αἵρεσιν περὶ οἰουδήποτε πράγματος, 'κείνον ἀφ' ὠρονόμοιο λογιζέο, σὸν δὲ τὸ δύνου,' ἢ πρᾶξις τὸ μεσουράνημα, τὸ τέλος τὸ ὑπόγειον, cod. Vind. 108 fol. 278 εἰαν δανείσασθαι θέλης, ἔστω ὁ μὲν ὠροσκόπος ὁ δανειστής, τὸ δὲ δύνου ὁ δανειζόμενος, τὸ διδόμενον τὸ μεσουράνημα· τὸ δὲ ὑπόγειον μὲνύσει τὴν ἔκβασιν τοῦ χρόους.

In 214 I have written αὐτῇ for the αὐτῇ of the MS, which is really the same thing. Mr Kroll's αὐτῷ is unnecessary and undesirable: αὐτῇ is τῇ πρῆξει, see 237 ἔργου τέλος.

226-228.

ναὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἀνακτα <τόπου> τεκμαίρεο Μήνης
ἥδὲ καὶ ὠρονόμου, μή που κεκρυμμένοι ἢ
φθέγγεα μαρμαρυγῇ δεδασμένοι 'Ηελίοιο.

When Mr Kroll writes κεκρυμμένος εἶη | φέγγει μαρμαρυγῇ <τε> δεδασμένος 'Ηελίοιο, he retains just the one word which must at all cost be got rid of. The οἰκοδεσπότης Σελήνης and the οἰκοδεσπότης ὠροσκόπου are planets, and it is impossible for a planet to be δεδασμένος, divided or distributed, by the brilliancy of the sun. This too is poor diction, κεκρυμμένος φέγγει μαρμαρυγῇ τε δεδασμένος; nor do I see why the participles should be changed from plural to singular, for there are two ἀνακτες, not one. The following is easier and more effectual:

μή που κεκρυμμένοι εἶεν,
φέγγεα μαρμαρυγῇ δεδ<αμ>ασμένοι 'Ηελίοιο.

For the accusative compare 78 Κύπρις δ' ἐν Ταύρῳ γάννται νόον.

283-285.

ἡνίκα δ' ὠρονόμῳ κακομήτιες ἐγγεγάωσιν
ἀστέρες, εὐρύκεται δὲ θοῇ συνέωσι Σελήνη,
ἢ καὶ ἐναλλάγδην, σκαίην ποιοῦσι θάλασσαν.

'latet eūργεῖς uel sim.' says Mr Kroll (eūργοί rather); Mr Ludwich proposes εὐρέκται. The same amount of change, the omission of one letter and the transposition of another, will furnish a more natural and better authenticated word, εὐέρεκται. This contracted form of εὐεργέτης is used by Antipater of Thessalonica in *anth. Pal.* ix 92 3 sq. ὥς καὶ αἰοῖδος ἀνὴρ ξενίων χάριν ἀνταποδοῦναι | ὕμνος εὐέρκταις οἶδε παθὼν ὀλίγα.

If the
into prison
for the sen
ἀλγεα are
conjecture
him', is ap
for the lik
when π fol
Under

by adding
already ἐν
τετρύεται

γὰρ in
which Mr
γ' ἂ ν βρο
χρόνιος τό

δτε
t

χρηστι
ἀσπάζηται
F. Boll C.C
Mr Lu
declares in
Dorotheus
καὶ ἐσθλόν.

The h
have corre

326-328.

εὔτε δὲ βρυχητήρος ὑπερφορέοιτο Λέοντος,
 ἀνδρὸς ἔρισθενέος καὶ μείζονος ἄλγε' ἔκητι
 ἔπειτα, οὐδὲ μίνυθα συνέσσεται ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δηρόν.

If the Moon is in Leo τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ εἰργεσθαι, at the time when the man is cast into prison, then — what? 'fort. nil latet nisi ἔσσεται' Kroll. That cannot be, for the sense would require ἔστι. This is a chapter περὶ τῶν εἰργομένων, and the ἄλγεα are no future troubles but the present ills of imprisonment. Mr Ludwich conjectures ἔψεται: the verb ἔπεσθαι, 'come upon him', 'attach themselves to him', is appropriate, but again the tense is wrong; so I should propose ἔσπειται, for the likeness of σ to the first half of π often causes its omission or insertion when π follows.

Under the same misapprehension Mr Kroll completes the imperfect verse 334

Τοξευτήρ ἐπὶ μακρὸν ἐν ἄλγεσιν ἀνέρα

by adding <θήσει>, which the sense of the passage will not admit, for the man is already ἐν ἄλγεσι κείμενος. Some such verb as <τρύσει> is wanted: compare 324 τετρύσεται ἐν κακότητι.

348-350.

κῆν συναφὴν ἀκτίσιν ὑπ' Ἡελίοιο τυχοῦση
 Κύπριδι ποιῆται, τότε γὰρ βροτὸν αἰνὰ παθόντα
 ἐκ συνοχῆς λύσειεν ἀεικελίων τ' ὀδυνάων.

γὰρ in 349 unknowns the sentence, and Mr Kroll proposes τότε δ' ἄρ βροτὸν, to which Mr Ludwich objects that Dorotheus never uses this apocope. Write τότε γ' ἄν βροτὸν: 238 sq. ἐν Διδύμοις εὐτ' ἂν τις ἀπ' ὀγδοάτης ἀνάγηται, | νόστος μὲν χρόνιος τότε γ' ἔσσεται.

p. 91 l. 5.

οὐδὲ τόπος δὲ κακὸς, χρηστὸν ὁπότε ἀσπάξοιτο.

ὅτε ἀσπάζεται L.

text and note are Mr Kroll's: the following are mine.

οὐδὲ τόπος δὲ κακὸς, χρηστὸν ὅταν ἀσπάζηται.

χρηστὸν ὅτ' ἂν Par. 454, χρηστότε Laur. xxviii 34, χρηστὸν Monac. 287. ἀσπάζεται Ludwich progr. Regiom. 1899 p. 4, ἀσπάζεται codd., ὁπότε ἀσπάξοιτο F. Boll C.C.A.G. i p. 146, nondum prolato cod. Par.

Mr Ludwich objects to the lengthening of the last syllable of χρηστὸν, and declares in *Rhein. Mus.* 1904 p. 54 that it has no parallel among the remains of Dorotheus; but he has overlooked 116 τῶν ἄπο δὴ φράσαντο τέλος αἰσχρόν τε καὶ ἐσθλόν.

The hexameter fragments of Antiochus of Athens, two or three of which I have corrected in discussing u. 48 (7) above, are preserved in cod. Angelic. 29 an.

1388, and were printed, I cannot say edited, in 1898 by Mr A. Olivieri, *C.C.A.G.* i pp. 108-113. Since the title of Antiochus' work was *θησαυροί*, Mr Kroll is of opinion that it was only an anthology; and he suggests in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1899 p. 746 that the verses may belong to Dorotheus. That they most certainly cannot: they are the production of a much inferior and quite dissimilar poet. Dorotheus, within the space of 370 lines, disregards internal position only thrice in *τετράγωνος* and perhaps once in *ἀριθμός*: Antiochus (to call him so), within the space of 115, disregards it in *πατρί*, *πατρίδος*, *πατρώια*, *τέτρατον*, *ἀλλοτρίων*, *Ἀφροδίτη*, *τέχναις*, *ἀθρήση*, *ἀμφικρατοῦσαν*, and *ἄχρηστος*. And much other proof could I adduce; but not to be tedious I content myself with one decisive fact: Dorotheus has *κεν* or *κε* in some thirty places, Antiochus nowhere.

Antiochus' text also is much worse than Dorotheus' text, and indeed its plight is often hopeless. But even the MS itself is not in all respects so vicious as the printed page of Mr Olivieri, whose metre and spelling and accentuation are a sight to dream of, not to tell. *σῆμα δύνει, ἐσῆμ' αὖνε πλοῦτον, μείων πάλιν πλὴν, πολυαλγέας κύδιμος, ἡματα, ἡματι, ἡμάτιος, ὑπερδῶσει, ἀθρήσης, πολυάλγεα, πολυκέρδεα, πολυέργεα, χρυσοέργεα, πολυγήθεσι, εὐχαρίτας, κτέατοισιν, νιφιδέσσι, μοίραν* (four times), *χερείον, χαριλάμπετις, ἐριτίμον, τεκεῶν, φιλοπαῖδα, ἡίθεων, φαινόμενοις τε ἐν, πλοῦτον τε, Ζεύς δε, οὐ ποτιφαίνοι, ἄντιος ἔστιν Ἀρήει*: seldom does a Greek MS amass within this narrow compass so many blunders of this particular sort; and the notes inform us that some of them at any rate are Mr Olivieri's conjectures, and one or two of them, sad to say, Mr Kroll's. Mr Olivieri, according to Mr Ludwich, is 'einer der rührigsten und tüchtigsten unter den jungen Philologen Italiens', and I daresay this judgment is no less true than dismal: *πάλαί ποτ' ἦσαν ἀλκιμοὶ Μιλήσιοι*.

The conjectures of Mr Kroll and Mr Ludwich¹ are as numerous in Antiochus as in Dorotheus, but because of the intractable condition of the text they are much less happy and effective. I shall therefore add few to their number; indeed there now remains only a couple of passages which I think I can emend.

p. 109 ll. 6-10 ("Ἥλιος ὥρονομῶν).

πολλοὺς φαινόμενοις τέκεν ἀρσενικοῖσι μάλιστα
ὀφθελὺς ζωιδίσις ἐν πλοῦτον ἔχοντας
καὶ χρόνον ἐν ζωοῖσι τέλος πολὺν ἦν δὲ κακοῖσι
συμμίξῃ, δόξας μειοὶ πάλι, πλὴν καλὸς ἐστὶ
καὶ πατρί καὶ βιότῳ καὶ ἀτάσθαλα πῆματα λυεῖ.

7

This is what the Sun does when found in the horoscope at the hour of birth. The second of the two sentences, thanks chiefly to Mr Ludwich, has been satisfactorily amended as above: the first is still unintelligible, and the conjectures of Messrs Olivieri and Kroll and Ludwich are to me unintelligible also. To

¹ *Kritische Beiträge zu den poetischen Erzeugnissen griechischer Magie und Theosophie*, Königsberg 1899, pp. 4-11.

match the ἦν κακοῖσι συμμῖξῃ, 'if he be conjoined with the bad planets' (see Doroth. 355 συμμίσγουσα = συμμίσγομένη), of the second sentence, we want something like ἦν ἀγαθοῖς συμμῖξῃ in the first; and when Mr Olivieri thus records the reading of the MS in l. 7, 'ἐν, posteaque compendium quod difficile explicatur,' I remember that there is a word which begins with ἐν, means ἀγαθοῖς, and suits the metre: Maxim. 262 εἰ μὲν συμφορέται ἐν ἡέσι ν ἄστρασι καλοῖς, 561 ἦν δὲ σὺν ἀστέρι Μῆνῃ ἐν ἡέσι καλὰ φασίην. So I propose to find a sense and construction for πολλοῖς φαινομένοις as follows:

πολλοῖς φαινομένοις τέκεν, ἀρσενικοῖσι μάλιστα
ὀφθεῖς ζωϊδίοις, σὺν ἐν ἡέσι πλοῦτον ἔχοντας
καὶ χρόνον ἐν ζωοῖσι τέλος πολύν.

πολλοῖς φαινομένοις σὺν ἐν ἡέσι, accompanied with the appearance of many benefics.

In l. 8 they alter τέλος to ἴλεον, τελεῖν, τελεῖ, but it is quite sound and good. The construction is τέκεν ἔχοντας πλοῦτον καὶ τέλος: τέλος means *potestatem*, *magistratum*, and χρόνον πολύν means *diu*.

p. 109 ll. 12, 13 (Κρόνος ὠρονομῶν).

ἦν δὲ Κρόνον λεύσσης κέντρον κατέχοντα μέγιστον
ὠρονομοῦν, κακός ἐστιν, χρεϊότερος δ' ἐπὶ νυκτί.

ἀχρεϊότερος Kroll; but write rather

κακός ἐστι, χερειότερος δ' ἐπὶ νυκτί,

for χερειότερος, not ἀχρεϊότερος, is the comparative of κακός, and at p. 112 l. 19 the word is again corrupted to χρεϊότερον.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE EPIC CYCLE.

ENOUGH and too much has been written about the Epic Cycle. Upon scanty quotations and a jejune epitome a tedious literature has been built.¹ The older writers, such as Welcker, tried to 'reconstruct'—as profitable and satisfying a task as inferring a burnt manor-house from its cellars; later scholars have gone out in tracing the tradition of the poems through the learned age of Greece—a scaffolding without ties, by which this or that conclusion is reached according to temperamental disposition to this or that fallacy. I do not intend to enter more than is needful into a controversy where so far as I can see everyone has gone beyond the evidence. If I add to the bulk of the literature, it is in the hope of putting things in their proper places and of presenting the data as they appear to a future editor.

I.

Our only direct evidence for the contents of the Cycle other than the quotations is the *Chrestomathia* of Proclus the Neoplatonist, who died A. D. 485 and whose life by his disciple Marinus remains to us as well as a biographical article in Suidas.² The latter's ascription of the *Chrestomathy* to the philosopher was doubted by the Frenchman Valois,³ who followed by Welcker, gave it to an earlier grammarian of the same name. The philosopher has been restored to his own by O. Immisch in an authoritative article (*Festschrift Th. Gomperz dargebracht* 1902, pp. 237-274 'Beiträge zur Chrestomathia des Proclus und zur Poetik des Alterthums'). Immisch's proof appears to be complete and does not need support from one who is far from at home in the Neoplatonic world. Marinus' life however while it is silent about the Manual, has some interesting accounts of Proclus' philological activity: his grammatical teacher was Orion (c. 8); another teacher Plutarch son of Nestorius urged him to compile a commentary on the Phaedo, φάσκων ὅτι συμπληρωθέντων αὐτῷ τῶν σχολίων ἔσται καὶ Πρόκλου ὑπο-

¹ Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus*, 1849-1865; Nitzsch, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der epischen Poesie der Griech.* 1862, pp. 206 sq.; D. B. Monro, *J.H.S.* 1883, 305 sq.; *Odyssey* xiii-xxiv, 1901, pp. 340 sq.; U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Homeriche Untersuchungen*, 1884, pp. 328 sq.; E. Bethe, *Hermes* xxvi (1891), pp. 593 sq.; R. Wagner, *N. Jahrb.* 1892, ff. 241 sq. (reply to Bethe); E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wisowa, 'Apollodoros,' esp. 2883-6 (with other references).

² Πρόκλος ὁ Λόγιος, μαθητὴς Κυριανοῦ, διουκνήθη διὰ καὶ Πλουτάρχου τοῦ Νεστορίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου, καὶ

αὐτὸς φιλόσοφος Πλατωνικός. οὗτος πρότερον τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις φιλοσόφου σχολῆς, καὶ αὐτοῦ μαθητὴς καὶ διδύχου χρηματίζει Μαρίνος, ὁ Νεωπλάτης. ἔγραψε πᾶν πολλὰ,—φιλόσοφα καὶ γραμματικά. ὑπόμνημα εἰς ἔκον τὸν 'Ὅμηρον' ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὰ 'Ἡσιόδου Ἔργα καὶ 'Ἡμέρας' περὶ χρηστομαθίας βιβλία γ'. περὶ ἀγωγῆς β'· εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν Πλάτωνα βιβλία δ'· εἰς τὴν 'Ὀρφείου θεολογίαν. Συμφωνίαν 'Ὀρφέου, Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνα· περὶ τὰ λόγια βιβλία ι'. περὶ τῶν κατ' 'Ὁμήρου θεῶν· ἐν χειρῶματι κατὰ Χριστιανῶν γ'.

³ Valesius de crit. i. 20.

μνύματ
Republ
Days e
is desc
παρ' αὐ
day, an
years o
comme
διδασκα
μετωπί
εἰς 'Ὀρ
we are
charact
Catena
ὑπομνη
philoso
ἀρχαίαι
would
early
ancien
The h
Byzan
found
Libran
in a c
Select
Hesiod
produ
be foun
for th
preced
interp
scholios

The
Proclus
ἐνὶ ποί
λέγει
Marinus
(Suidas
'Ερ
Photius
the end
τῆς προ
might h
only Be
ample s
NO.

μνήματα φερόμενα εἰς τὸν Φαίδωνα. His commentaries on the Timaeus and the Republic remain to us, and have been recently edited; that on Hesiod's Works and Days exists in scholiastic form (edited separately by Vollbehr, 1844). His research is described: *πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς τῶν παλαιότερων συγγράμμασιν ἐπεξιών, ὅσον μὲν ἦν παρ' αὐτοῖς γόνιμον, τοῦτο μετ' ἐπικρίσεως εἰσεποιεῖτο*: he wrote about 700 lines a day, and the total of his quires (τῶν τετράδων) corresponded with the seventy years of his life (c. 25). His affectionate disciple allured him into vouchsafing a comment upon Orpheus: *ἤξιωσα παραγράφειν αὐτὸν τὰ ἀρέσκοντα τοῖς τοῦ διδασκάλου βιβλίοις. πεισθέντος δὲ τοῦ ἀγαθοειδεστάτου καὶ παραγράφαντος τοῖς μετωπίοις τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, ἔσχομεν συναγωγὴν εἰς ταῦτον ἀπάντων, καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς Ὀρφέα αὐτῷ σχόλια καὶ ὑπομνήματα στίχων οὐκ ὀλίγων*. It is not often that we are allowed such a view of the genesis of scholia. Proclus' procedure is characteristic of his period: the *ὑπόμνημα* was beginning to pass into the *Catena*. By Eustathius' century the process was complete, for when he quotes *ὑπομνηματισταί* it is plain he means scholiasts. Proclus' interests were philosophical and mystical, and before he died he said *κύριος εἰ ἦν, μόνα ἂν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀπάντων βιβλίων ἐποίουν φέρεσθαι τὰ λόγια καὶ τὸν Τίμαιον*. Still it would not be alien to such a laborious and eclectic mind to throw off, perhaps, an early work, for self-preparation and the preparation of disciples, a manual of ancient verse-literature, in which authentic Hellenic mythology was embalmed. The handbook, partly theoretic and partly historical, appears to have dominated Byzantine education during the subsequent centuries. Photius (d. circ. 891 A.D.) found it in an epitome (*ἐκλογαί*), and gave an abstract of the epitome a place in his Library: traces are also found in a grammarian among the *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, in a commentary upon Gregory of Nazianzus, and in Tzetzes (Immisch p. 240). Selections were prefixed, from the tenth century onwards, to MSS. of Homer and Hesiod by way of introduction to the authors. A somewhat similar literary product of Neoplatonism is held to have been Menander's rhetorical work now to be found among the *Rhetores Graeci* (ib. p. 249); and if further evidence is needed for the attribution of philological work to Proclus, he is amply covered by the precedent of his predecessor Porphyrius, who two hundred years before devoted interpretation to the Iliad and Odyssey of which copious remains exist in our scholia.¹ The *Chrestomathia* consisted of four books.²

¹ The handsome Ammonianus, kinsman of Syrianus, Proclus' Master, chose the sedentary lot; *ἡγάγα τὴν ἐνὶ κοιτῇ ἀνεγχεῖν καὶ διορθῶσαι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς λίστης καθήμενον τέχνην*: Agapius, a disciple of Marinus, his successor, *ἠδαιμάζετο ἐνὶ φιλομαθίᾳ* (Suidas in vv.).

² *Ἔστι δὲ τὸ βιβλίον εἰς δ' ὑπὸ μνημονὸν λόγους* Photius (τῶν εἰς δ' ὑπὸ μνημονὸν τὸ α' Ven. A), but at the end of his summary he remarks *ὁ μὲν δὲ δύο λόγοι τῆς Πρόκλου γραμματικῆς χροστομαθίας ἐν τούτοις*. It might have been supposed that Proclus summarised only Books I and II as the more important, but his ample account of elegy and lyric makes it plain that he

included all four, especially as we see from Ven. A f. 6 r. that Book II opened only with the Aethiopis. Therefore instead of *δύο* in Photius I would read *δ'*.—Suidas in his article has *βιβλία γ'*. Immisch p. 240 explains these discrepancies as signs of different systems of division. I should be inclined to see in the numeral γ' a sign of attrition. In the time between Proclus and Suidas, or even between Photius and Suidas, under the influence of repeated epitomes and extracts, one book might well have fallen away. Between Suidas and 1453 all, of course, perished.

The portion of the Chrestomathy which dealt with Homeric Epos has come down to us in two states, A and B; and B actually from at least two sources. A is the epitome of the whole work made by Photius for his Bibliotheca, f. 318 B 21 Bekker. It is more highly compressed than the other versions, being apparently a précis of extracts. It opens *ἀνεγνώσθησαν ἐκ τῆς Πρόκλου χρηστομαθίας γραμματικῆς ἐκλογαί*. ἔστι δὲ τὸ βιβλίον εἰς δ' διηρημένον λόγους. καὶ ἐν μὲν τῷ α' λέγει κτλ. The first book began with principles, and a classification—narrative and imitative poetry: to the former belong epos, elegy, iambus, and melos. He then, f. 319 A 8, treats epos: the mythical inventor, Phemonoe, the meaning of the word *ἔπος*: then v. 17

- γεγόνασι δὲ τοῦ ἔπους ποιηταὶ κράτιστοι μὲν Ὅμηρος, Ἡσίοδος
Πεῖσανδρος, Πανύσιος, Ἀντίμαχος. διέρχεται δὲ τούτων ὡς οἶόν τε
καὶ γένος καὶ πατρίδας καὶ τινὰς ἐπὶ μέρους πράξεις. διαλαμβάνει
δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ λεγομένου ἐπικοῦ κύκλου, ὃς ἀρχεται μὲν ἐκ τῆς Οὐρανοῦ
5 καὶ Γῆς μυθολογουμένης μίξεως, ἐξ ἧς αὐτῷ καὶ τρεῖς παῖδας ἐκατόγ-
χειρας καὶ τρεῖς γεννῶσι Κύκλωπας, διαπορεύεται δὲ τὰ τε ἄλλως περὶ
θεῶν τοῖς Ἑλλήσι μυθολογούμενα, καὶ εἰ ποῦ τι καὶ πρὸς ἱστορίαν ἐξαλη-
θίζεται. καὶ περατοῦται ὁ ἐπικὸς κύκλος, ἐκ διαφόρων ποιητῶν συμπλ-
ηρούμενος, μέχρι τῆς ἀποβίσεως Ὀδυσσεὺς τῆς εἰς Ἰθάκην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ
10 ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς Τηλεγόνου ἀγνοοῦντος κτείνεται. λέγει δὲ ὡς τοῦ ἐπικοῦ
κύκλου τὰ ποιήματα διασώζεται καὶ σπουδάζεται τοῖς πολλοῖς οὐχ οὕτω
διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὡς διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πραγμάτων. λέγει
δὲ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τὰς πατρίδας τῶν πραγματευσαμένων τὸν
ἐπικὸν κύκλον. λέγει δὲ καὶ περὶ τινων Κυπρίων ποιημάτων, καὶ ὡς
15 οἱ μὲν ταῦτα εἰς Στασίον ἀναφέρουσι Κύπριον, οἱ δὲ Ἡγησίον
τὸν Σαλαμίνιον αὐτοῖς ἐπιγράφουσιν, οἱ δὲ Ὅμηρον. δοῦναι δὲ ὑπὲρ
τῆς θυγατρὸς Στασίης, καὶ διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ πατρίδα Κύπρια τὸν πόνον
ἐπικληθῆναι. ἀλλ' οὐ τίθεται ὁ συγγραφεὺς ταύτῃ τῇ αἰτίᾳ: μὴδὲ
γὰρ Κύπρια προπαροξυτόνως ἐπιγράφεσθαι τὰ ποιήματα.

He then proceeds to Elegy. I have quoted this passage in extenso in order to be able to refer to it.

Our next survivals of the Chrestomathy are on a much larger scale, apparently *ἐκλογαί* of the first instance, but they are very fragmentary. The sources are the MSS. of Homer and Hesiod.

At some time earlier than the tenth century, the portion of books 1 and 2 relating to Homer and the Cyclic poets was excerpted, and the *ἐκλογή* prefixed by way of preface to Homer's works: at least we know from the surviving headings that a preface of this extent once stood at the beginning of the tenth century Venetian MS. of the Iliad (Marc. 454). The titles are f. 1 *πρόκλου χρηστομαθίας γραμματικῆς τῶν εἰς δ' διηρημένων τῶ α'. ὁμήρου χρόνοι βλὸς χαρακτήρ: ἀναγραφὴ ποιημάτων* and f. 6 r. *πρόκλου χρηστομαθίας γραμματικῆς τὸ δεύτερον. αἰθιοπίδος εἰ ἀρκύνου*. The first nine pages of the Ven. A are it is well known in a disturbed

state,
is ho
in the
ποιητ
words
resum
the ti
of the
contai
nothin

T
of He
furthe
—'An
more
excerp
Iliad
of wh
the Ili
at Na
Munic
related

T
least,
The se
beyond
to say
indep
the fou
which
The no
traditi
which
surviva
more c
one pa
the sec
upon t
subject
in the

¹ Jahn
1873, pp
Jackson
writer J.

state, and have been the subject of much investigation.¹ The problem they contain is however solved since at least Wissowa's paper *Hermes* 1884, 198 sq. Actually in the Ven. A there remains on both sides of f. 1 a life of Homer, beginning ἐπὼν ποιηταὶ γεγόνασιν πολλοί and ending with a catalogue of his works, of which the last words are κέρκωπας κενούς. After this leaves have fallen out in the MS. and the text resumes on f. 6 (bound up out of place) with Book II of the Chrestomathy under the title Αἰθιοπίδος ἐ' Ἀρκτίνου. The MS. from this point continues the analysis of the poems of the Cycle, ending with the Telegonia on f. 4 v. The last leaf f. 9 v. contains a sort of index of writers quoted in the scholia, which apparently has nothing to do with the Chrestomathy.

There are however other sources for this part of the Chrestomathy: the life of Homer (no. 3 in Westermann, p. 24) is found in many Homeric MSS., often further adapted to the purpose by the omission of the first sentence ἐπὼν ποιηταὶ —'Ἀντίμαχος. Some MSS. however have the full opening, and a few, what is more important, the analysis of the Cypria, which followed the Life of Homer in the excerpt, and accidentally fell out of the Ven. A (last printed by Dindorf, Scholl. Iliad xxxiv, xxxv). These MSS. as far as is known are Escorial Ω I. 12 (s. xi), of which the latest account is given by Bethe, *Rh. Mus.* 1893, p. 369 (the text of the Iliad has not yet been collated), a twelfth century (?) MS. in private hands at Naples (see Welcker *Ep. Cycl.* ii. p. 504); and three fifteenth century MSS. Munich 111, Parma H H ii. 27, Perugia E 48, which offer a text of the Iliad closely related to that of the Ven. A.

The age of the Escorial MS. makes it unlikely that, in the case of this MS. at least, the *Life* and the *Cypria* were copied from the Ven. A in its original state. The selection of these Prolegomena from Proclus' Chrestomathy must be put back beyond this period, though how far, failing evidence from papyrus, it is impossible to say: accidents to the first gathering of copies of the Iliad must have happened independently, and the relation between the presumable parent of the Escorial and the four later MS. and that of the Ven. A is undetermined. The life of Hesiod, which belonged to this part of the Chrestomathy, is found in the Hesiodic MSS. The notices of Pisander, Panyasis, and Antimachus have perished, so far as direct tradition is concerned.² The beginning of the Cycle, the analysis of the poems which preceded the Cypria, is also lost. With these reservations the total of the survivals, as printed by Dindorf, corresponds fairly to the programme in Photius' more compressed epitome, and the correspondence of the two versions appears in one particularity. In Photius' abstract (p. 66, v. 14) we are inclined to think that the section λέγει δὲ καὶ περὶ τινων Κυπρίων ποιημάτων κτλ., with the discussion upon the authorship and the meaning of the title, occur too late; but that this subject was reserved by Proclus for separate treatment is shown by the statement in the fuller version, ἐπιβάλλει τούτοις τὰ λεγόμενα Κύπρια ἐν βιβλίοις φερόμενα

¹ Jahn-Michaelis, *Griechische Bilderchronicon*, 1873, pp. v sq. (with Studemund's views); T. W. Jackson and D. B. Monro, *J.H.S.* 1883, 305 sq., the writer *J. Ph.* 1899, 161 sq.; Comparetti, in the

Leiden facsimile, *frag.*

² A substantial piece however of Peripatetic learning is quoted from the commentary on the *Timaeus* i. p. 28 c (Kinkel p. 274).

ἐνδεκα, ὧν περὶ τῆς γραφῆς ὕστερον ἐροῦμεν, ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἐξῆς λόγον νῦν ἐμποδίζωμεν. In the fuller version this section with the general remarks on the Cycle (vv. 10-14) is lost, but it stood originally in Proclus where Photius found it.

II.

The Homeric part of Proclus' Chrestomathy being thus and within these limits restored, what is the authority of the work? The answer to this question bears especially upon Proclus' interesting statement (*supr.* v. 10) λέγει δὲ ὡς τοῦ ἐπικοῦ κύκλου τὰ ποιήματα διασώζεται καὶ σπουδάζεται τοῖς πολλοῖς οὐχ οὕτω διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὡς διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πραγμάτων. Down to Welcker inclusive this sentence was understood in its natural sense, that the Cycle owed its survival down to Proclus' time not so much to its merit as to the sequence of events in it. At the present moment however it is held by all the German writers whose names I have mentioned as beyond dispute that the Cycle did not survive until or nearly until Proclus' time; his abstracts were not made from the poems, which no human eye had seen for centuries, but from a handbook, either a κύκλος (to which his remarks refer) or the actual extant Pseudoapollodorus. Even the late Mr. D. B. Monro inclined in this sense (pp. 342-5). The whole question of the survival of the classics and the date of the disappearance of those which are lost, is so interesting, and depends so much on statements like this of Proclus, that I make no apology for reconsidering the evidence.

It is maintained that Proclus' διασώζεται has no value (Immisch even thinks that the present tense is an indication of conveyance from an earlier source), and that his abstracts, which name nothing but the poems, are taken from manuals. On these two points—(1) the definite statement that particular literature is extant, (2) the acknowledgment of quotation through an intermediate when it is not made directly, I propose to examine the usage of three important Greek writers: Plutarch the historian, Pausanias the antiquary, Stephanus of Byzantium the geographical lexicographer.

Plutarch speaks of books surviving in the following places:

Lycurg. 21 ὅλως δὲ ἂν τις ἐπιστήσῃ τοῖς Λακωνικοῖς ποιήμασιν, ὧν ἔτι καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐνία διασώζετο.

Cat. min. 23 τοῦτον μόνον ὧν Κάτων εἶπε διασώζεσθαι φασὶ τὸν λόγον.

Cic. 1 καὶ τι ποιημάτων ἔτι παιδὸς αὐτοῦ διασώζεται.

Nicias 5 Hieron, son of Dionysius Chalcus, οὐ καὶ ποιήματα σώζεται.

Crassus 33 Artavasdes τραγηδίας ἐποίει καὶ λόγους ἔγραφε καὶ ἱστορίας, ὧν ἐνία διασώζονται.

Brutus 13 καί τι βιβλίδιον μικρὸν ἀπομνημονευμάτων Βρούτου γεγραμμένον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διασώζεται.

Lucullus 1 διασώζεται Ἑλληνικὴ τῆς ἱστορίας τοῦ Μαρσικοῦ πολέμου.

He acknowledges borrowed quotations:

Romulus 17 ὡς Ἰόβας φησὶ Γάλβαν Σουλπίκιον ἱστορεῖν.

Lycurgus 23 φασὶ τινες ὡς Ἑρμιππος μνημονεύει . . .

Timol. 36 Sophocles is quoted through Timaeus.

Solon 11 ὡς λέγειν φησιν "Ερμῖππος Εὐάνθη τὸν Σάμιον . . .

Theseus 32 Ἡρέας παρέχεται μαρτύρια [3 verses].

Demosth. 5 "Ερμῖππός φησιν ἀδεσπότης ὑπομνήμασιν ἐντυχεῖν.

We proceed from the Boeotian antiquary to Pausanias, his junior by a generation or two. Pausanias, who wears the air of a candid writer, is fond of specifying his studies: his phrases are like these:—

I. 12. 2 ἔστι δὲ ἀνδράσι βιβλία οὐκ ἐπιφανέσιν ἐς συγγραφὴν, ἔχοντα ἐπίγραμμα ἔργων ὑπομνήματα εἶναι. ταῦτα ἐπιλεγόμενοι μοι μάλιστα ἐπῆλθε θαυμάσαι κτλ.

22. 7 ἐγὼ καὶ ἐπη μὲν ἐπελεξάμην, ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ πέτεσθαι Μουσαῖον ὑπὸ Βορέου δῶρον, δοκεῖν δέ μοι πεποιήκεν αὐτὰ Ὀνομάκριτος. (= IV. i. 5).

37. 4 ὅστις δὲ ἤδη τελετὴν Ἑλευσίνι εἶδεν ἢ τὰ καλούμενα Ὀρφικά ἐπελέξατο, οἶδεν ὃ λέγω.

II. 2. 2 (the tomb of Neleus) οὐκ ἂν οἶδ' εἰ ζητοίη τις ἐπιλεξιόμενος τὰ Εὐμήλου.

II. 4. 1 τάδε μὲν οὕτως ἔχοντα ἐπελεξάμην, . .

2 ἐγὼ τε πείθομαι καὶ ὅστις τὰ Ὀμήρου μὴ ὑπέρργον ἐπελέξατο.

31. 3 καὶ τι βιβλίον Πιτθέως δὴ σύγγραμμα ὑπὸ ἀνδρὸς ἐκδοθὲν Ἐπιδουρίου καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπελεξάμην.

IV. 2. 1 πυνθέσθαι δὲ σπουδῇ πάντῃ ἐθελήσας οἱ τινες παῖδες Πολυκάρου ἐγένοντο ἐκ Μεσσήνης, ἐπελεξάμην τὰς τὴν Ἥοιαν καλουμένας καὶ τὰ ἔπη τὰ Ναυπάκτια, πρὸς δὲ αὐτοῖς ὅποσα Κιναιθῶν καὶ Ἄσιος ἐγενεαλόγησαν. Which poems he quotes frequently elsewhere.

VI. 19. 5 ἐμὲ δὲ ἐσήλθεν ἀνίμνησις ὡς Θουκυδίδης ποιήσειεν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις Λοκρῶν τῶν πρὸς τῇ Φωκίδι καὶ ἄλλας πόλεις, ἐν δὲ αὐταῖς εἶναι καὶ Μυονέας. Cf. viii. 11. 3 ὀνόματα δὲ αὐταῖς ποιητῆς μὲν ἔθετο οὐδεὶς, ὅσα γὰρ ἐπελεξάμεθα ἡμεῖς, cf. x. 4. 2.

VIII. 18. 1 (Linus' verses) ἐμοὶ δὲ ἐπιλεγόμενῃ παντάσῃς ἐφαίνετο ταῦτα γὰρ εἶναι κίβδηλα.

37. 12 μνημονεύουσι δὲ καὶ ἔπη τῆς Ἑρατοῦς, ἃ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπελεξάμην.

IX. 27. 2 (Pamphos' and Orpheus' hymns to Eros) ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπελεξάμην ἀνδρὶ ἐς λόγους (ἐλθὼν) δαδουχοῦντι.

31. 5 the Hesiodic canon: ἔπη Μαντικά, ὅποσα γὰρ ἐπελεξάμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς.

X. 12. 11 τούτων πλὴν Λύκου τῶν ἄλλων ἐπελεξάμην τοὺς χρησμούς.

31. 2 Διομῆδην δὲ τὸν ἀποκτείναντα εἶναι . . . ἐπιλεξιόμενος ἐν ἔπαισι οἶδα τοῖς Κυπρίοις.

He disclaims first-hand knowledge.

IX. 29. 2 ταύτην τοῦ Ἥγησίνου τὴν ποιήσιν οὐκ ἐπελεξάμην, ἀλλὰ πρότερον ἄρα ἐκλεοιπνῖα ἦν πρὶν ἢ ἐμὲ γενέσθαι. Κάλλιππος δὲ Κορίνθιος ἐν τῇ ἐς Ὀρχομενίου συγγραφῇ μαρτύρια ποιεῖται τῷ λόγῳ τὰ Ἥγησίνου ἔπη, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς πεποιήμεθα παρ' αὐτοῦ Καλλίππου διδαχθέντες.

38. 9 (Chersias' verses) τοῦδε τοῦ Χερσίου τῶν ἔπων οὐδεμία ἦν κατ' ἐμὲ μνήμη, ἀλλὰ δὲ καὶ τόνδε ἐπηγάγετο ὁ Κάλλιππος ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον τὸν ἔχοντα ἐς

'Αρχιμάλη . . . ὡς 'Αθηνόδωρος περὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ πατρίδος γράφων καὶ παραθεῖς Διόδωρον τὸν γραμματικὸν συμφωνοῦντα.

'Αλεξανδρεῖα . . . Δίδυμος δὲ παρατίθεται χρῆσιν ἐξ Ἐρατοσθένους τὸ 'Αλεξανδρίτης.

'Αφυσθος . . . ἔστι καὶ εἶδος φυτοῦ, περὶ οὗ Βώλως ὁ Δημοκρίτειος ὅτι Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ περὶ φυτῶν ἐννάτῳ . . . The mediate source has perished, the immediate remains.

Γάγγαρ . . . πόλις θηλυκῶς, ἣν 'Αλέξανδρος ἐν τῷ περὶ Παφλαγονίας ἀναγράφει λέγων οὕτως ὅτι Νικόστρατος φησι κτλ.

Γάλλος . . . οἱ περίοικοι [κατὰ?] Προμαθίδαν Ποταμογαλληνοί, οὓς παρατίθησι ὁ Πολυίντωρ. Alexander apparently quoted Promathidas as well as the word.

Δωδώνη . . . προσθετόν οὖν τῷ περιηγητῇ Πολέμωνι, καὶ 'Αριστείδῃ τὰ τούτου μεταγεγραφέα.

Κάρυστος . . . 'Αλκμάν ἔφη, καθὰ Στράβων δεκάτῃ.

Πασαργάδαι . . . Διότιμος ἐν ἐξηκοστῷ πέμπτῳ παντοδαπῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων, παρατιθέμενος 'Αναξιμένην ἐν μεταλλαγαῖς βασιλέων οὕτω γράφοντα.

The epitomised state of the later part of the Lexicon accounts for the omission of many more authorities, primary and secondary. Enough however remains to show Stephanus' method. We notice the signs of the times: epitomes were in vogue,¹ and the earlier grammarians only accessible through the later.²

These instances might be multiplied. I have said nothing of Strabo and little of Athenaeus. The scholia also, especially the dramatic, contain many instances of the use of *σώζεται* and its equivalents.³ The three authors I have quoted make it plain that in the first, second, and fifth or sixth centuries A.D. a serious writer when he quoted otherwise than at first-hand gave the immediate source of his quotation; and conversely that the term 'survival' applied to books bore its full meaning. I do not mean to say that ancient writers never appropriated the learning of their source; on the contrary when the author quoted by the source was in existence they copied the quotation with a light heart, as only too often appears; carelessness must be allowed for, and the accidents of tradition (such as epitomising) which carry away the acknowledgments of the original. But the normal usage of a classical antiquarian was to ascribe works inaccessible to him to their source; and,

¹ See under 'Ἀρκεία, Ἀσταί, Δόμη, Μαδάκη, Ροτείς.

² E.g. ὡς Ἐπαφρόδιτος, παρατιθεῖς τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον ἐκτεχόμενον οὕτω (i.e. Δουλιχίαν), ὡς Ἡρόδωτος, ὃν παρατίθειν Ἐπαφρόδιτος (i.e. Δρόνην).

³ Vlt. *Εκν.* p. 4 v. 9 Schwartz τὰ πάντα δ' ἦν αὐτῷ δράματα 28, σώζεται δὲ σή; *Acharn. arg.* i οὐ σώζονται (Cratinus) Χειμαζόμενοι; *schol. Ran.* 13 ἐν τοῖς εὐφομένοισι αὐτοῦ . . . ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀπολωλόσι αὐτοῦ (Phrynichus): 270 διασώζεται καὶ ἐν τισιν ἡ γραφή, 1344 Asclepiades εὖρε Ἀθήσιν ἐν τινι τῶν διασωθέντων, *Nub.* 144 οὐδὲν δὲ αὐτοῦ διασώσεται τῶν συγγραμμάτων (Chaerephon!). *Εκκ.* of φέρεσθαι; *Pax arg.* iii ἐν τῇ νῦν φερομένη; *schol. Nub.* 549 οὐ

φέρονται αἱ διδασκαλίαι τῶν δευτέρων Νεφελῶν: 361 φέρεται δὲ καὶ Προβίου βιβλίου ἐπιγεγραμμένον Ὀραι: *Λαν.* 14 οὐ οὐδὲν φέρεται (Lycis), 1206 οὐ γὰρ φέρεται νῦν Εἰρινίου λόγος οὐδὲς τοιούτος (the Archelaus). The evidence from Suidas is not abundant; from vol. i. Bernhardt cf. *vlt. Aristoph. Suidas*, δράματα δ' αὐτοῦ μὲν ἄτερ δὲ πεπεράχμεν [= ἐνετέχονεν, φέρεται] Ἀριστοφάνους δράματα ταῦτα [the existing], Damophilus . . . γράφας πάμπολλα, ἐξ ὧν ταῦτά μοι εὕρηται ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν βιβλίων θήκαι. Dionysius Alex. οὐ εὕρον ὑπόμνημα εἰς Ἐκκλησιασθῆν Σολομῶντος, λαν εὐφραδέ. *Εκκ.* of φέρεται and οὐ φέρεται s. Ἀντίρως, Εὐδοξος, Ἐφορος, Ζωναῖος, Ζωρόστρη, Ἡρόδης, Θόμυρις, Θεμιστογενής.

unless we impute bad faith or levity to Proclus, his distinct statement must be accepted; and when he says τοῦ ἐπικού κύκλου τὰ ποιήματα διασώζεται, we must believe that the Cycle existed in the fifth century.

This argument blows up the edifice erected by the German critics during the last twenty years. I rest my conclusions on the evidence I have adduced, and consider myself excused from entering into the tortuous assertions of Herrn Bethe and v. Wilamowitz. I will however add some general observations on the subject.

Why is it so lightly assumed as a self-evident proposition, that originals disappear? and that therefore the question is only which 'manual' Proclus copied, the κύκλος of Dionysius Scytobrachion, the handbook of Theodorus the writer of the *Tabula Iliaca*, or the Mythology of Apollodorus? The major premiss at the back of the critics' mind, is I presume that the abstract kills the original.¹ The case occurs; but you cannot infer to a given instance. The story of the Iliad and Odyssey is embalmed in Apollodorus, in the hypotheses, the *Tabula Iliaca*, in at least three paraphrases, Psellus, Moschopoulos, and Demosthenes Thrax, who was in Eustathius' library. The Iliad and Odyssey are still with us. The story of Demeter from the Homeric Hymn is found in Apollodorus; the Homeric Hymn was rifled to make an Orphic poem; the story of Hermes also is told in Apollodorus and the other mythographers, who quote many authorities; further, after Pausanias, with the exception of a doubtful quotation in Stephanus, there is no mention of the Hymns. The night of time swallowed them: their death might have been inferred on better grounds than that of the Cycle. Why then, when the head of the Neoplatonic school in the fifth century says the Cycle existed, and gives the reason, do we treat him as a patent liar (Bethe's word)? Dionysius of Mytilene's prose *Ἀργοναυτικά* did not interfere with that of Apollonius, and Theopompus reduced Herodotus to two books without extinguishing the Father of History. Epitome and original often exist together: there is the case of Livy; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *de Compositione Verborum* and the epitome thereof are printed side by side in the editions. I protest against the view which implies that ancient antiquarians were incapable of serious research, and which limits their diet to the husks of manuals. Such was not the procedure of Timaeus, who says he had spent incredible sums in collecting ὑπομνήματα (Polyb. xii. 28. 1) and that he settled for 50 years at Athens to be at the centre of the book world (ib. xii. 25 d, and 27. 4), or of Diodorus, who celebrates the similar advantages of Rome (i. 4). Do we believe Photius? when the patriarch says ἀνεγνώσθησαν, did he really read? Oh ponderous frivolity! Get you to Anchises' nurse, search for the name Achilles bore among the virgins.

The Cycle however is lost now. Why? Because the reasons which had kept it alive down to Proclus' time ceased soon after. Stephanus does not quote it,

¹ Even the real, the Alexandrian Apollodorus did not excerpt the Cycle (Bethe p. 602). Why? And when centuries later Hadrian tried to revive Anti-

machus, οὐ μὴν τὸ βρομα πολλοὶ πρότερον ἠπίσταντο, did he seek to revive a textbook or a poet?

though
twelfth
anyth
are no
κατὰ
Τηλεγ
last tw
as in
Comm
betwe
occurs
largel
Eusta
Cycle
As lo
was n
Neop
and c
but co
I
that
ποιητ
a pro
ἐπικο
the su
The i
Schw
κύκλ
which
κύκλ
277 E
from
Suid.
καὶ ῥ
ιστορ
last
in vo
litera

¹ H
Theop
tas, th
third
scholi
σώζον

though as we noted above he has a large range of epic reading. Eustathius in the twelfth century, to judge from his commentary upon the *Odyssey* had hardly anything which we have not. A few glossaries and the like are all his titles which are not now in existence.¹ Now Eustathius quotes the Cycle three times: 1685, 37 κατὰ τὸν πεποιηκότα τὴν κυκλικὴν Θηβαΐδα (=Athen. 465 E), 1796. 38 ὁ τὴν Τηλεγονεΐαν γράψας Κυρηναῖος, *id.* ὁ τοὺς νόστους ποιήσας Κολοφώνιος. For the last two quotations there is no other source. Do we then apply the same argument as in the case of Proclus, and bring the life of the Cycle down to the age of the Comneni? Clearly not: (1) on account of the palpable loss of ancient literature between the times of Stephanus and Eustathius; (2) because the first quotation occurs in one of Eustathius' great sources Athenaeus, and Athenaeus who exists largely in an epitome may have originally contained the other two;² (3) because Eustathius, unlike Proclus, makes no overt statement about the survival of the Cycle, but fourthly and principally owing to the closing of the schools by Justinian. As long as ancient philosophy, fed by ancient mythology, was taught, so long there was no reason for the extinction of ancient epos, and it survived. But when Neoplatonism gave place to official Christianity, Moses took the place of Orpheus, and our First Parents supplanted Οὐρανός and Γῆ. The Cycle, having no merit but consecutiveness, quickly atrophied.

If then Proclus' credit on the main question is upheld, it would seem to follow that his wording in detail deserves attention; for instance that v. 8 ἐκ διαφόρων ποιητῶν συμπληρούμενος means, as it purports, 'composed of various poets,' not of a prose abstract of the poems of various poets; and v. 10 when he says τοῦ ἐπικοῦ κύκλου τὰ ποιήματα διασώζεται he does not mean a handbook containing the subjects of the Cycle is in existence, but the poems which form the Epic Cycle. The instances of the word κύκλος applied to literature may be found in Monro or Schwartz, and I will not repeat all of them here. From them it appears that κύκλος was, as Aristotle knew, an ambiguous term: it applied (1) to literature which naturally covered a period or a long action (*Ar. Post. An.* 77 b 31 τὰ ἔπη κύκλος; *Soph. El.* 171 a 9 ἡ τοῦ Ὀμήρου ποιήσεις σχῆμα διὰ τοῦ κύκλου, Athen. 277 E ἔχαιρε δὲ Σοφοκλῆς τῷ ἐπικῷ κύκλῳ. Surely the Attic bee did not sip from a manual), (2) to a selection or arrangement of literature (Agathias in *Suid. s.v.* καὶ τὸν κύκλον τῶν νέων ἐπιγραμμάτων ὃν αὐτὸς συνῆξεν ἐκ τῶν κατὰ καιρὸν ποιητῶν, (3) to a handbook. (Dionysius Milesius in *Suid. s.v.* κύκλον ἱστορικὸν ἐν βιβλίοις ζ'). There is no reason to confuse the uses, nor to make the last extinguish the first. The first, applied to the whole Tale of Troy (and more) in verse, was a grammarian's term, descriptive of an already existing body of literature, which it was convenient so to classify. It does not imply an interference

¹ He quotes Alcman (1892. 45), Alcaeus (1902. 52), Theopompus (1854. 18, 1863. 50), Callinus or Philetas, the edition of Aristarchus (1885. 51), through third persons; Philoxenus (1570. 37) through the scholia; and, well for him, has the equivalent of σώσθαι about the Cyclops: 1850. 38 ὁ μέχρι νῦν

ἐπισκόμενος Εὐριπίδους Κύκλῳ.

² Similarly the grammarians Megalides (1594. 30) and Philyllius, etc. (1571. 5), whom Eustathius cites without authority, probably came from the scholia, more abundant in his day than they are now.

with or adaptation of the original poems any more than the *Ἀρχαία, Μέση*, and *Νέα κωμῳδία* of the grammarians, or the Alexandrian *Πλειάς*.

The discrepancies between Proclus' abstract and the quotations of the Cycle on which the hypothesis of the existence of a manual called *Κύκλος*, after the disappearance of the Cycle, has been based, are examined in the next section.

T. W. ALLEN.

(To be continued.)

Re
P
propos
On Ca
779, R
Comm
Text a
Paul M
Plaut.
his Gr
praemi
Plautu
On som
possible
Antoin
of a pl
misprin
de Fin.

R
O
age wh
petitio
defeat.
Quinti
from v
Neithe
Actia
benefit
Critici
Note a
Appul
Oreste
March
ical.
by and
La fig
sulle a
Gaetan
Anaba
critici
Bassi.

M
F
editor.

Méon, and

the Cycle
after the
ction.

ALLEN.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

Revue de Philologie. Vol. 31. Nos. 2 and 3. 1907.

Palaemon-Melkart, Louis Havet. On Plautus *Rud.* 161 'Hercules Oritulus' is proposed for 'Herculis socius' of MSS. *Observations on Plautus* (continued). On *Capt.* 920, *Cas.* 143, 230-1, 271, 313, 332, 347, 613, *Cist.* 88 (Ter. *Andr.* 392, *Most.* 779, *Rud.* 823), 95, 101, 111, 156, 531, 616, 744, the same. *The Argument of Achilles.* Commentary on Aristotle *Phys.* vi. 9, by Theodorus Metochites d. A.D. 1332, C. E. Ruelle. Text and translation. *The 'dossier' of Gaudentius Donatist Bishop of Thamugadi*, Paul Monceaux. *Ennius Achilles ap. Non.* 147. Louis Havet. *Pro machaera turturem*, *Plaut. Bacch.* 68, Ph. E. Legrand. Plautus appears to have misread $\pi\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\alpha$ for $\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\gamma\omega\nu\alpha$ in his Greek original. *Velleius Paterculus*, ii. 88. 2, Paul Lejay. Read 'angusti clavi praemio contentus.' *Tertullian de Praescriptione Haereticorum* xlv. 4, P. de Labriolle. *Plautus Captivi*, Georges Romain. Notes on 184, 551 sqq. 612 (l. Quid agam), 928. *On some eras employed by the Byzantines*, Daniel Serruys. *To what extent improvement is possible in the text of Fortunatus*, E. Rey. Critical discussion of nine passages. *Latin sclareia*, Antoine Thomas. This is not the name of a musical instrument as generally supposed but of a plant 'clary,' as explained in T. H. Key's dictionary. The mistake may be due to a misprint in Georges. *On a passage of the De Finibus*, G. Rodier. On the well-known crux *de Fin.* iv § 50 regarding the sorites. *Bulletin bibliographique.*

Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica. Vol. 35. No. 3. 1907.

On some points in the biography of Statius, Giacomo Giri, 1. Date of Statius's birth. His age when married to Claudia. 2. Date of his father's death and of his own victory in the competition at Naples. 3. The cause of Statius' removing to Naples. The year of his Capitoline defeat. 4. On the censure passed on Statius for publishing the *Silvae*. The question whether Quintilian (x. 3. 17) refers to Statius is discussed. *Addenda to the Corp. J. L.* (continued from vol. 34. p. 579), F. Eusebio. *On the Herculeum papyrus* No. 817, Giovanni Ferrara. Neither the Bodleian nor the Neapolitan copy of the fragments of the so-called *De bello Actiaco* is complete. The writer intends to publish what more can be made out for the benefit of scholars. *Dalmatian and Latin a propos of a recent publication*, Clemente Merlo. Criticisms on M. G. Bartoli's *Das Dalmatische* (5 vols.) published by the Vienna Academy. *Note on Persius*, 1. 58 sqq., Pietro Rasi. Reads in 60 'nec linguae, quantum sitiat canis Appula, tantae' and understands 'linguae tantae' as plural. *On ps.-Verg. Catalept.* 1, Oreste Nazari. *On another obscure epigram attributed to Virgil* (Catalept. 11), Ettore De Marchi. *Quintilian as flatterer*, Augusto Balsamo. The eulogies of Domitian cannot be ironical. *On the Poem of Lucretius*, the same. It shows manifest traces of having been edited by another hand. Reviews: Bick's *Horazkritik seit 1880*, Pietro Rasi. Amerigo Rivoiro's *La figura di Socrate in Aristofane*, Ettore Bignone. Achille Parravicini's *Studio di Retorica sulle opere di Claudio Claudiano* and Luigi Ceci's *Grammatica Latina ad uso delle scuole*, Gaetano Curcio. F. Schubert's *Sophokles Oidipus Tyrannos*, Angelo Taccone, A. Bersi's *Anabasis of Xenophon*, Achille Cosattini. Joannes Helch's *Der Cratesis Malloiae studiis criticis quae ad Iliadem spectant*, Augusto Balsamo. *Summaries of Periodicals*, Domenico Bassi.

Mnemosyne. 35. 3. 1907.

H. T. Karsten, *De Commentis Donatiani comp. et orig.* (contd.). Scholia inserted by the editor, mainly in the Phormio commentary. His work on Phormio II. 3. The fourth class

of scholia. Van Leeuwen, *Ad Aristoph. Ran.* 186. The words of Photius and Suidas (on ὄνου πόκας) suggest that ὄκνου πλοκαί had been already suggested by Aristarchus. H. van Herwerden, *Ad Procopium* (contd.). Notes on the Ἀνέκδοτα and Haury's text. Van Leeuwen, *Ad Schol. Aristoph. Ran.* 501. J. Vürtheim, Ὁ Αἰρναῖος μέγιστος κύνβαρος. On the tetradrachms of the city of Aetna appeared the scarabaeus, and the Athenians scoffed at the person (? Hiero) *qui foetido ateucho ad nummos noui imperii uti statuerat.* J. W. Bierma, *De Ennii fragmentis.* Based on Vahlen.² Deals with arrangement of fragments and, mainly, the text: e.g. 67 *postquam sistit se fluiuis, 90 se radiis dedit apta foras lux* (cp. 339 *nox stellis apta*), 100 *nisi tu iam mi . . . das poenas (nisi almost = certe*: cp. Ter. *Andr.* 663, Plaut. *Stich.* 269), 282 *quae ferri puluis.* v. L., *Ad Arist. Ran.* 1196 *ὥς εἰ ὀτταρήρησεν*, 'as (happy as) if . . .'. Both ὥς and καί were abbreviated to ε.

35. 4. 1907.

K. Kuiper, *De Pirithoo fabula Euripidea.* Defends against Wilamowitz-Moellendorf the Euripidean authorship of the Pirithous. The Pirae inscription, the Schol. on *Orest.* 982, a gloss on which part of the schol. on Apoll. Rhod. 4.143 is founded, and Plutarch offer sufficient external evidence: internally, the metre, diction, and thought of the fragment's point the same way. Under the last head the views of E. on the effect of training on man's nature (Fragments 597, 598) and theology (Fragm. 593, 594) are discussed. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum.* Quomodo adulator 4: read *συνεκρίπτοντοσαν* for *συνεμν.* J. C. Naber, *Observ. de iure Romano* (contd.). 97 *de pignore legitimo.* 98 *Quomodo satisfactio euitetur.* H. v. Herwerden, *Platonica* (contd.). On *Republic, Timaeus, Critias.* J. J. H., *Ad Hor. ep.* 1. 16. 51. Read *suspensos laqueos.* H. T. Karsten, *De Commentis Donatiani comp. et orig.* (contd.). Additions by various magistri. Scholia where the sources are named or indicated by words like *quidam.* J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchi de Tranq. An.* 1. The words *τῶν φυσικῶν παθῶν* are the remains of a note on the next sentence, running something like *ὁ τοῦ σώματος κόσμος οὐκ ἀπαλλάττει τῶν φυσικῶν παθῶν.* S. A. Naber, *Additamenta ad Cobeti operum conspectum.* Addenda to article in Vol. 34, p. 430.

Rheinisches Museum. 62. 3. 1907.

F. Solmsen, *Vordorische in Lakonien.* Epigraphic evidence for shortening of *καρά* before other letters than dentals in Laconia: this, like the change of *σ* between vowels to an aspirate, probably a relic of the pre-Dorian language. P. Wessner, *Der Terenzkommentar des Eugraphius* (contd.). 3. Relations between the α MSS. 4. Our Eugraphius MSS. represent a very small area—all seem traceable to Northern France, with Paris as the most southerly station. 5. Eugraphius. Terence MSS. text midway between Bembine and family δ. Summary: α the outcome of a commentary based on a Terence MS. which contained a combination of Eugraphian notes with those of the Commentum recens, β descendant: of a single MS. of Eugraphius, which can be traced to N. France. G. Friedrich, *Zu Martial.* Emends ix. 47. 5, xi. 49. 3, *Sp.* 4. 3, vii. 47. 5, x. 5. 5, viii. 30. 6; defends MSS. at xii. 52. 9-10, the reading of PQw at xi. 90. 3; explains i. 68, xiv. 189, *Sp.* 23 and iii. 20. 8. W. Crönert, *Neue Lesungen des Didymospapyrus.* E. Diehl, *Das Signum.* Adds to Mommsen's list many names which he claims to be *signa* (e.g. from 'acclamations' in epitaphs, greetings on goblets and rings). They denote membership of clubs of various kinds, taking their names from e.g. abstract ideas (Constantia, Concordia), gods and heroes, countries and places, etc. F. Rühl, *Die Makrobier des Lukianos.* Most of the statements as to the ages of famous personages due simply to calculations made by the author—for which purpose he uses a chronicle not quite the same as that of Eustathius, perhaps that of Thallus. E. Bethe, *Die dorishe Knabenliebe.* Puerorum amorem apud Doricos quidem cum institutis eorum militariibus arte cohaerere: credi enim amatorem uirtutum suam in coitu alteri inspirare posse: cf. *ἰσπνίλας*, etc. *Miscellen:* F. B., *Coniectanea.* J. M. Stahl, *Zu Thukydides*, ii. 52. 4, *θήκη* simply *sepultura*: cp. Plat. *Rep.* 427 b; iii. 39. 6 *πάντες γὰρ* means 'all the democrats' and the object of *ἐπιθετο* is 'the oligarchs': *ἐν τῇ πόλει εἶναι* 'enjoy full franchise.' G. Crönert, *Animaduersiones in Photii fragm. Berol.* G. Mercati, *Eustathianum.* The Laurentine Eustathius was sent to Rome by order of Clement VII sometime before May 16, 1536. See Rh. Mus. 62. 289 sqq. G. Némethy, *Zur Ciris-Frage.* The Ciris a forgery like the Culex: parallelisms to the pseudo-Tibulliana in both poems. P. Thielscher, *Zu den Maniliushandschriften.* A. Zimmermann, *Zur Entstehung des Gentilianens des Dichters Plautus.* Maccius an Oscan name, the Atellani originally performed

in Oscan and by Campanians: may not the Roman citizens who afterwards acted them have called themselves (and their guild) by the name *Maccii*? T. Birt, *καφάλις als Buchterminus*. 'Roll.' L. Friedländer, *Petronianum*. A performance of the 'Banquet' at the Russian court in 1751.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc. 19. 7. 1907.

A. Busse, *Der Schauplatz der Kämpfe vor Troja*. An investigation of Plin. N.H. 5.33 and Strabo xiii. 595, 597 suggests that in their time (or that of their sources) the Scamander (Mendere) flowed, as now, on the W. side of the plain and in its lower course presented much the same features as it does to day, being joined, not far from its mouth, by the Simois (Dumbrek-Tschai). The Homeric descriptions (e.g. Δ 497, where ἐν' ἀριστερά is from Trojan standpoint) justify us in assuming that much the same was the case at the time when the poems arose. K. Dieterich, *Römer—Römaer—Romanen*. The Eastern Empire: its lack of colonising instinct, its inorganic centralisation really centrifugal (that of Russia: the W. empire represents England), subservience of its art to the church, lyrics ruined by lack of romantic spirit. Yet it produced what Rome and Italy never produced, a popular epic. Its ecclesiastical art influenced N. Italy, its popular traditions and institutions S. Italy and Sicily. Fresh air brought into the cloisters by the conquest of Constantinople in 1204. Whilst the Franks could not long maintain their feudal state of Peloponnesus, Venice was more successful with the isles of the Archipelago: the Cretan popular poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth century represents an amalgamation of Greek and Latin elements, and paves the way for sound development of the new Greek literature. *Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: H. Lechat's *Pythagoras de Rhégion and Phidias et la sculpture grecque*, etc. noticed by W. Amelung, who in a *Nachtrag* on Studniczka's article on the Tyrannicides (*N.f.* 1906, pp. 545 sqq. seems to think we really know nothing of the Antenor group; Πλάτων τε ἐργονείας καὶ διορθώσεως Στ. Μωπαίων I. (Introd., Apology, Crito, Gorgias) favourably noticed by O. Apelt; L. Hahn's *Rom und Romanismus im griech-röm. Osten* reviewed by K. Dieterich. 'The main thing is that we have here a beginning—and one full of promise—of the treatment of a theme which offers still richer prospect for the later centuries, up to Justinian.'

19. 8. 1907.

E. Zitelmann, *Der Rhythmus des fünf Fussigen Jambus*. F. Bölte, *Rhapsodische Vortragskunst*. The question of the technique of those who recited the Homeric poems closely connected with that of their interpretation. The speech of Apollo in X 8 sqq., the Thersites-scene, and the beginning of H examined from this point of view show that the rhapsodists went far in giving dramatic form to their readings, breaking up the hexameters into longer or shorter cola in order to heighten the mimetic effect. All this clearest in the later parts of the work. P. Corsen, *Zur Erklärung der Römeroden des Horaz*. Odes III 3. Neither Augustus nor Antonius can have thought seriously of rebuilding Troy and transferring the seat of empire thither. Juno's warning means really 'Avoid foreign influence: preserve the distinctive Roman character.' Cp. Verg. *Aen.* 12. 827-8. This thought the outcome of the struggle between Augustus and Antony: the ode reflects that struggle and the civil wars in general more closely than has yet been understood. As for the first stanzas, a careful analysis of the previous ode (where *silentio* of l. 25 means 'avoidance of glory,' and the reference is ultimately to Maecenas) shows that they refer to Cato of Utica. O. Harnack, *Zum hundertsten Geburtstag F. T. Vischers*. *Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: W. Helbig's *Les innais athéniens* and *Zur Geschichte des röm. Equitatus* reviewed by Lammert, who whilst welcoming the work of one who is a master of the archaeological material and has used all that was available, combats his view that the Greek and Roman 'knights' were at first simply mounted hoplites, who rode to the field of battle and there dismounted, remounting only to retire or to pursue the routed enemy.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1907.

3 July. R. Richter, *De ratione codicum Laur.* *Plut.* 69, 2 et *Vatic.* 126 in *extrema Thucydis historiarum parte* (S. Widmann), favourable. E. Hohmann, *Plato ein Vorgänger Kants?* (J. Kaufsen), favourable. Directed against Natorp's *Platos Ideenlehre*. P. Foucart, *Étude sur Diados d'après un papyrus de Berlin* (W. Crönert), favourable. F. Gaffiot, *Equi fuerit si particulae in interrogando latine usus* and *Le subjonctif de Subordination en*

Latin (H. Blase), favourable of both. W. Altmann, *Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit* (C. Watzinger). 'A rich collection of material hitherto imperfectly known.' V. Ussani, *La questione e la critica del così detto Egesippo* (C. Weyman), favourable.

10 July. P. Gardner, *A Grammar of Greek Art* (B. Graef), very favourable. H. Schmidt, *fona. Eine Untersuchung zur vergleichenden Religionsgeschichte* (C. Fries), favourable. B. Powell, *Erichthonius and the three daughters of Cecrops* (H. Steuding). P. Foucart, *Sénatus-Consulte de Thisbé* (H. Gillischewski), favourable. O. Güthling, *Erklärende Anmerkungen zu Arrians Cynegeticus* (E. Pollack), favourable. P. Werner, *De incendiis urbis Romae aetate imperatorum* (R. Pohl). 'Gives a short and clear collection of the material.'

17 July. *Thucydides* erkl. von J. Classen. 6. Band (Book VI). 3. Aufl. von J. Steup (P. Widmann). H. Francotte, *Le pain à bon marché et le pain gratuit dans les cités grecques* (H. Gillischewski), very favourable. E. K. Rand, *A Harvard Manuscript of Ovid, Palladius and Tacitus* (Ed. Wolff). P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum* (Soltau). 'Deserves a warm welcome.'

24 July. Bacchilide, *Epinici, ditirambi e frammenti*, di A. Taccone (J. Sitzler), favourable. Guil. Schroeter, *De Simonidis Cei melici sermone quaestiones* (L. Weber), favourable. J. Bick, *Horazkritik seit 1880* (J. Häussner), favourable. C. Hosius, *De imitatione scriptorum Romanorum imprimis Lucani* (Helm), very favourable. *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*, cur. E. Nestle and *Novum Testamentum Latine*, cur. E. Nestle (W. Soltau), favourable of both. X. Hürth, *De Gregorii Nazianzeni orationibus funebribus* (J. Dräseke), favourable.

7 Aug. J. Engel, *Ethnographisches zum Homerischen Kriegs- und Schützlingsrecht* (Chr. Harder), favourable on the whole. W. Bernhardt, *De alliterationis apud Homerum usu* (J. Sitzler), favourable. G. Kazarow, *Zur Geschichte der sozialen Revolution in Sparta* (Schneider), favourable. J. Sundwall, *De institutis rei publicae Atheniensium post Aristotelis aetatem commutatis*. I. (Schneider), very favourable. *Ciceronis orationes pro Sex. Roscio, de imperio Pompei, pro Cluentio, in Catilinam, pro Murena, pro Caelio*, rec. A. C. Clark (J. Tolkiehn), favourable. J. J. Hartman, *Analecta Tacitea* (Ed. Wolff), favourable on the whole. Reprinted from *Mnemosyne*. Fr. v. Duhn, *Pompeji, eine hellenistische Stadt in Italien* (H. Belling), rather unfavourable. *Mélanges H. d'Arbois de Jubainville* (A. Holder). A collection of dissertations on Celtic literature and history in honour of the veteran Celtic philologist.

14 Aug. Guil. Deecke, *De Hectoris et Aiace certamine singulari* (Chr. Harder), rather unfavourable. V. Costanzi, *Saggio di Storia Tessalica*. I. (Schneider), favourable. O. Kern, *De epigrammate Larissaeo commentariolus* (H. Steuding). A. Rahm, *Über den Zusammenhang zwischen Chorliedern und Handlung in den erhaltenen Dramen des Sophokles (und Euripides)* (H. Draheim), favourable on the whole. G. Bohnenblust, *Beiträge zum Topos περί φιλίας* (A. Bonhöffer), very favourable. P. Linde, *De Epicuri vocabulis ab optima Attide alienis* (Helbing), favourable. C. O. Thulin, *Die etruskische Disziplin*. I. *Die Blütlehre*. II. *Die Haruspizin* (H. Steuding), very favourable. C. O. Thulin, *Italische sakrale Poesie und Prosa* (H. G.), very favourable. F. Rosenberg, *Zu Horaz und Cicero* (K. Loeschhorn), favourable. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, herausg. von O. Stählin. I. *Protrepticus und Paedagogus*. II. *Stromata I.-VI.* (J. Dräseke), very favourable.

28 Aug. Fr. Cumont et E. Cumont, *Studia Pontica*. II. *Voyage d'exploration archéologique dans le Pont et la petite Arménie* (P. Goessler), favourable. A. Malinin, *Hat Dörpfeld die Enneakrunos-Episode bei Pausanias tatsächlich gelöst oder auf welchem Wege kann diese gelöst werden?* (W. Dörpfeld), unfavourable. J. Kromayer, *Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland*. II. *Von Kynoskephalae bis Pharsalos* (R. Oehler), very favourable. G. Kropatschek, *De amuletorum apud antiquos usu capita duo* (L. Denbuer), 'A useful piece of work.' R. Sabbadini, *I codici Milanesi del De Officiis di Cicerone*. Senecas *Apokolokyntosis*, herausg. von A. Marx (W. Gemoll). 'Though intended for schools is useless for them, being without a commentary.' *Tacita opera*, rec. J. Müller. Ed. maior, vol. II. *Historiae et opera minora continens*. Ed. altera (E. Wolff). *Sprachwörterbuch*, herausg. von Fr. v. Lipperheide. Lief. 21, 22 (Fr. H.), favourable.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL.

American Journal of Archaeology. Part 2. 1907.

1. C. R. Morey : The arming of an Ephebe on a Princeton vase. (Two plates and cut.)
Publishes an early B. F. amphora shewing the official arming of an ephebos in the sixth century ; most monuments with this subject are of later date. [There does not appear to be much in the scene depicted to differentiate it from ordinary arming.]
2. Alice Walton : An unpublished Amphora and an eye-Cylix signed by Amasis in the Boston Museum. (Two plates ; two cuts.)
Publishes an amphora from the Bourguignon collection, shewing Amasis at his best ; the subjects are the rape of the Delphic tripod and Thetis bringing the armour to Achilles. Also a fragment of a kylix, the only one known by this artist.
3. W. H. Goodyear : The discovery by Prof. G. Giovannoni of curves in plan concave to the exterior in the façade of the temple at Cori. (Nine plates.)
Discusses curvilinear refinements in the architecture of this temple, shewing that they contravene the received view of optical corrections by means of convex curves, and consequently disprove Penrose's theories. The use of concave curves in more recent buildings, such as Pisa Cathedral, is also discussed.
4. A. W. van Buren : An inscription of the charioteer Menander. (Cut.)
An inscription supposed to be a memorial tablet of Menander's successes in A.D. 15.
5. P. Baur : Pre-Roman antiquities of Spain. (14 cuts.)
Summary of recent discoveries, describing objects in British Museum and Louvre, including pottery of quasi-'Aegean' character.
6. C. D. Curtis : Coins from Asia Minor. (Plate.)
An account of coins collected in 1904 from Cilicia, etc.
7. Archaeological Discussions, July-Dec. 1906, ed. J. M. Paton.
8. Bibliography of archaeological books, 1906, ed. J. M. Paton.

Jahrbuch des deutschen archaologischen Instituts. xxii. Heft 1. 1907.

1. J. Six : Nealkes. (One cut.)
Discusses Nealkes as a miniature-painter compared with Protogenes as a master of large style.
2. F. Studniczka : More on the shrines on the Kitharodos-reliefs. (Cut.)
Supplementary note to paper in vol. xxi, correcting statements about the temple at Delphi.
3. E. Petersen : Porthenon and Opisthodomos.
Disputes some points in Michaelis' explanation of the latter term (*Jahrbuch*, xvi. p. 24) and discusses the use of the term in literature and inscriptions.
4. E. Maass : The contest over Temesa.
Discusses what is known of the temple of Hera Lakinia, the springs of Leuka, the painting described by Pausanias (vi. 6. 11) of the story of Euthymos, and the poem of Callimachus on his conversion into a hero, pointing out what light they throw on the contest between Euthymos and Alybas over Temesa.

Anzeiger.

- (1) Excavations in Numantia. A. Schulten. (13 cuts.)
- (2) Berlin Arch. Gesellschaft, December meeting. (Five cuts.)
- (3) Notices.
- (4) Bibliography.

H. B. W.

NUMISMATIC.

Numismatische Chronicle. Part 2. 1907.

Sir H. Howorth. *Some Notes on Coins attributed to Parthia.* Compare *Classical Quarterly*, vol. i, p. 95.—F. Haverfield and G. Macdonald. *Greek Coins at Exeter.* The writers examine the composition of the various hoards of Greek coins alleged to have been

dug up at Exeter in the nineteenth century, and show that such finds must have been due to hoaxes or frauds. 'Greek Coins or other non-Italian coins from the Mediterranean, whether minted during the Roman Empire or in earlier days, are very uncommon in Britain,' and many supposed instances of the finding of such coins prove, on investigation, to be unfounded: in such a case are the 'numerous Greek coins' of Verulam, the 'Carthaginian' coins of Bath, and a Worcester hoard of Greek coins which was 'purposely buried by an archaeological lady.'—P. H. Webb. *The Coinage of Carausius*. The second part of the monograph begun in the previous number of the *Numismatic Chronicle*: it consists of descriptions, 493 in number, arranged in tabular form under the mints of London and Colchester.—Sir John Evans has a note (pp. 272 f.) on some silver coins of Carausius with the inscription *RENOVAT. ROMAN.* which he suggests may mean 'Renovatio Romanorum Numorum,' such pieces being, possibly, called *Romani*. His remark that 'in early mediaeval times there was a gold coin called the "Romanatus" or "Romaninus"' hardly, however, supports or illustrates his contention, because the coin in question—a gold 'bezant'—was not named from 'Rome,' but from one of the Byzantine Emperors who bore the name 'Romanus.' So, 'Michalati' were called after an Emperor Michael and 'Manulati' from an Emperor Manuel. There is a bare possibility, it is further suggested, that the puzzling exergual mark R S R 'might be interpreted *ROMANUS SIGNATUS RUTUPIAE*.'

Journal international d'archéologie numismatique. Vol. ix. Part 4. 1906.

The whole of this part is taken up by Svoronos's descriptive account, with four plates, of the numismatic acquisitions of the National Museum of Athens during the year 1905-6. Excavations at Delos have especially enriched the collection, notably in the Athenian series and in the Roman Republic coins of the time of M. Antonius.

Rivista italiana di numismatica. Part 2. 1907.

F. Gnechi. Descriptions of Imperial coins.—G. Dattari. *Nuova teoria sulle monete Romane d'orichalcum e dei sistemi monetari di Augusto e di Nerone*. The conclusions arrived at are:—the relation between copper and orichalcum was as 48 to 64 and not 7 to 12. Coins of orichalcum have a higher value than those of copper. The systems of Augustus and Nero are not semi-uncial. The coins of bronze which at present are classified as 'semis' and 'quadrans' belong to three divisions called 'libella,' 'sembella,' and 'teruncius.' T = the uncia; II, the sextans.—L. Corra. *Ripostiglio di denari repubblicani di Roma*.

Revue numismatique. Part 2. 1907.

G. Seure. *Nouvelles monnaies de Kabyle de Thrace*.—Froehner. *Les monnaies coloniales de Corinthe*. On coins bearing the names of Duumviri. If the size of the *flan* permits, the two magistrates (till the reign of Claudius) both place their names on the coin, but two varieties of the coin are struck, on which the *order* of the two names is varied; thus, on one variety the magistrate A stands first, and B second; on the other variety B has the first place and A the second. Where there is not room for both names on the same coin, two varieties are struck, one signed by A alone, the other signed by B alone.—E. Gohl. *Usine monétaire et fonderie celtique à Szalaska (Hongrie)*. The find includes some Celtic coins and dies used for making such coins (Plates III-VI).—Review, from the numismatic side, of V. Chapot's 'La Province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie,' by Dieudonné.

WARWICK WROTH.

been due to
can, whether
Britain,' and
tion, to be
arthaginian'
uried by an
part of the
consists of
London and
rausius with
Romanorum
ly mediaeval
ly, however,
ezant'—was
e the name
ulati' from
the puzzling

rt 4. 1906.

four plates,
ear 1905-6.
nenian series

sulle monete
sions arrived
not 7 to 12.
of Augustus
d as 'semis'
'teruncius.'
Roma.

anaies coloni
an permits,
oin, but two
thus, on one
ne first place
two varieties
ne monétaire
nd dies used
V. Chapot's

k WROTH.